REFLECTIONS

ON

Mr. *Wall's* HISTORY

OF

Infant-Baptiſm.

In ſeveral Letters to a FRIEND.

JOB vi. 24, 25.

Teach me, and I will hold my tongue: and cauſe me to underſtand wherein I have erred.

How forcible are right words! but what doth your arguing reprove?

LONDON:

Printed, and Sold by J. DARBY in *Bartholomew-Cloſe.* MDCCXI.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

3 Ne

Advertiſement.

THERE wou'd have been no need to tell the Reader that the following Letters were written in the Years 1705, 1706. but that, there having been two Editions of Mr. *Wall*'s Hiſtory, he might ſee the Reaſon why the firſt of theſe is made uſe of, and conſtantly refer'd to.

And as theſe Letters were originally deſign'd for the private peruſal of a Friend, ſo it is not to be thought ſtrange that they were not publiſh'd ſooner, but rather that they are publiſh'd at all: for the Author, tho he was urg'd to it pretty early, had no Thought nor Inclination, in the leaſt, to have given the Publick this trouble. He hop'd a more learned Advocate wou'd have been engag'd in this Controverſy: But it ſeems that Gentleman did not think it neceſſary, ſince Mr. *Wall* had not pretended to reply to his *Anſwer to Mr.* Ruſſen; and had alſo been convinc'd by him in private Converſation, that he was miſtaken in charging him with a Miſrepreſentation of a Paſſage out of Dr. *Allix*'s *Remarks on the Antient Church of* Piedmont, which he promis'd to rectify, together with ſome other Inadvertencies, in his ſecond Edition.

It not being known therefore that a direct Anſwer to Mr. *Wall*'s Book was deſign'd by any other Hand, the Author's Friends repreſented to him how much the Pædobaptiſts on all Occaſions boaſted of that ſuppos'd unanſwer-

able Performance, which has indeed been highly recommended and extoll'd by the moſt learned among 'em, and by ſome in Print.

Mr. *Reeves*, ſpeaking of the Hiſtory of *Pelagius*, ſays, ‖ "'Tis treated of by Dr. *Forbes*, "*Du Pin*, and eſpecially by the learned Mr. "*Wall*, in his excellent Account of *Infant-*"*Baptiſm*; which laſt I particularly recom-"mend to the *Engliſh* Reader."

Dr. *Stanhope*, ſpeaking of the pretended *Jewiſh* Baptiſm, ſays, "* It is ſet in a very "clear Light, by the late excellent Labours of "a worthy and learned Divine," referring to Mr. *Wall* of Infant-Baptiſm, in the Margin.

And above all, the whole Clergy in Convocation have in a particular manner approv'd and commended the Book in the following *Vote* paſs'd ſoon after the Publication of it, to ſhew how very acceptable it was to 'em.

Feb. 9. 1705-6. "*Ordered*, That the Thanks "of this Houſe be given to Mr. *Wall*, Vicar "of *Shoreham* in *Kent*, for the Learned and "Excellent Book he hath lately written con-"cerning Infant-Baptiſm; and that (*a*) Dr. *B.* "and Mr. *R.* do acquaint him with the ſame."

Nay, Dr. *Atterbury*, the reputed Author of the *Proceedings in the Convocation*, *A. D.* 1705. *faithfully repreſented*, ſays, (*b*) The Hiſtory of Infant-Baptiſm was a Book "for which the "Author deſerv'd the Thanks, not of the

‖ Apologys, Vol. 2. p. 357. not.
* Paraphraſe, *&c.* on the Epiſtles, *&c.* Vol. 4. p. 340.
(*a*) The two *Proctors* for the Dioceſs. (*b*) Pag. 35.

"*Engliſh*

" *Engliſh* Clergy alone, but of all Chriſtian " Churches."

Theſe things, together with the Importunity of the Author's Friends, did at length prevail with him to ſuffer the Publication of the following Reflections, to inform the Publick, that the *Anabaptiſts*, as they're call'd, notwithſtanding the Noiſe Mr. *Wall*'s Hiſtory has made, and the Reputation it has gain'd, are ſtill ſafe and untouch'd by him: and likewiſe to let theſe learned Gentlemen know, that they have been much too haſty in their Judgment, and that this Hiſtory is not by far what they take it to be.

The *Catalogue of Authors* added at the end of theſe Letters, was drawn up with a Deſign to have ſet down what Editions are made uſe of, in order to prevent any Miſtake that might otherwiſe happen; which is done with regard to the Authors of greateſt Conſequence in the Diſpute: but all the Books cou'd not be conveniently come at juſt when the laſt Sheet was to be printed; and therefore the Editions are not always noted, which the Reader is deſir'd to excuſe. The Author however promiſes to be anſwerable for all his Citations, which are none of 'em taken at ſecond hand: and if any are ſought for in one Edition, and not found, they may be met with in another.

THE CONTENTS.

LETTER I.

HEATS among Chriſtians inconſiſtent with their Profeſſion, and a great Diſhonour to Chriſtianity, p. 3. *This Reflection occaſion'd by a Letter the Author receiv'd, very unbecoming the Character of his Friend that ſent it*, p. 4. *The Author endeavours to find an Excuſe for his Friend*, ibid. *We are generally more ſubject to Paſſion in Matters of Religion, than in other Things*, ibid. *His Friend's great reſpect to the Church of* England, *which he thinks to be the beſt conſtituted* National *Church in the World, ſome ſort of Excuſe for him*, p. 5. *We have no infallible Judg on Earth*, p. 6. *Nothing can excuſe unreaſonable Exceſſes of any kind*, ibid. *Hard Names*, &c. *no real Prejudice to our Cauſe*, p. 7. *Mr.* Wall's *Moderation only pretended*, p. 8. *The Antipædobaptiſts hearty Friends to the preſent Government*, p. 9. *They who make the greateſt Outcries of the Church's Danger, known to be her greateſt Enemies*, ibid. *Perſecution for Religion, directly contrary to our* SAVIOUR's *Doctrine and Example*, p. 11. *Arguments from Scripture, the proper Means to convince Men*, ibid. *The Antipædobaptiſts open to Inſtruction*,

ſtruction, p. 12. *Mr.* Wall's *Hiſtory not ſo formidable as is pretended*, p. 13. *He is not much to be depended on*, p. 14. *His real Aim and Deſign was only to eſtabliſh the Baptiſm of Infants*; *as appears by conſidering his Pretence from* Juſtin-Martyr, p. 15. *Another from St.* Cyprian, p. 16. *Another from the* Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, p. 19. *He takes all occaſions to blacken the Antipædobaptiſts*; *diſguiſing his Deſigns with pretences to Moderation*, p. 20. *This Charge not inconſiſtent with Charity*, p. 22. *Learned Men are beſt able to judg of Matters*, p. 23. *Mr.* Wall *endeavours to poſſeſs his Readers with an Opinion of his Learning*, *by ſeveral needleſs Digreſſions*, *on the* Decretal Epiſtles, p. 23. *On the Hiſtory of* Pelagianiſm, p. 24. *And in this*, *on the Lawfulneſs of Oaths*, *and poſſeſſing of Riches*, ibid. *On the Virginity of our* LORD's *Mother*, p. 25. *On the* Socinians, *and the* Tritheiſm *they charge on the Fathers*, ibid. *This a Subject too difficult for Mr.* Wall, p. 26. *His ridiculous Reflection on Mr.* Stennett *noted*, p. 27. *Another Artifice to gain Reputation*, *by quarrelling with ſeveral of the greateſt Men for Learning*, &c. p. 28. *As Archbiſhop* Tillotſon, ibid. *Biſhop* Burnet, ibid. Rigaltius, p. 29. Gregory Nazianzen, *Father and Son*, ibid. *St.* Chryſoſtom, p. 30. *Mr.* Le Clerc, p. 31. *Difference in Opinion no warrant to diſpenſe with the Rules of Charity*, ibid. *Moral Vertues more acceptable to* GOD, *than ſpeculative Notions*, p. 32. *Mr.* Le Clerc *no* Arian, Photinian, *or* Socinian, p. 33. *Mr.* Wall *alſo quarrels with* Grotius, p. 38. *The Senſe of a Paſſage in St.* Gregory *ſet right*, *which Mr.* Wall *had miſrepreſented*, p. 40. *The Senſe of a Canon of the* Neocæſarian *Council reſcu'd from the Force Mr.* Wall *put upon it*, p. 42. *As alſo the Words of* Zonaras *and* Balſamon *in relation thereto*, p. 43. *St.* Auſtin *and* Pelagius *ſpeak of the End*, *not of the Subjects of Baptiſm*, p. 45. *He*

that takes ſo much Liberty with ſuch Men, will take more, in all probability, with the Antipædobaptiſts, ib. *Mr.* Wall *has not acted the Part of a faithful Hiſtorian towards us,* ibid. *He ſeveral times, on no ground at all, takes for granted ſome things, merely becauſe they favour his Deſign,* p. 46. *And charges the Antipædobaptiſts with whatever he has heard any one among 'em to have believ'd or ſaid,* ibid.

LETTER II.

THE private Opinions of a few not juſtly inſerted in the Hiſtory of the whole Body, p. 50. *There are probably ill Men among us, as well as among others,* p. 52. *Some of our Author's invidious Inſinuations,* ibid. *Our Adverſarys, inſtead of railing, ſhou'd endeavour to convince us from Revelation, or Reaſon, or Antiquity,* p. 53. *If their Reflections were true, our Reputation can't ſuffer much,* p. 54. *We are not guilty of the hated Opinions Mr.* Wall *loads us with,* p. 55. *Our Separation eaſy to be juſtify'd,* p. 57. *Mr.* Wall *has not ſufficiently ſhewn wherein the Sin of Schiſm conſiſts,* ibid. *He only explains it in general by* Diviſion, Separation, &c. ibid. *The true Notion of Schiſm,* p. 58. *It may either be lawful or unlawful,* ibid. *Who are Schiſmaticks,* ibid. *Not they who go out from a Communion they were before join'd with, but they who unneceſſarily give or take the Occaſion; or continue ſeparate without juſt Cauſe,* p. 59. *It being lawful in ſome Caſes, and unlawful in others to ſeparate; 'tis examin'd what will juſtify a Separation,* p. 60. *Mr.* Wall's *Diſtinction between Fundamentals and Non-Fundamentals, tho good in it ſelf, is inſufficient, unleſs he had determin'd what are Fundamentals, and*

and what not, ibid. *A Rule to know these*, p. 61. *CHRIST alone can determine what is necessary; and what he has not expresly made so, is not so*, p. 62. *'Tis useful to distinguish between things necessary to Salvation, and things only necessary to the Constitution of a true Gospel-Church*, ibid. *This Distinction well-grounded, because the Qualifications of a Christian and of a Church are very different*, ibid. *An Error in what is essential to the Constitution of a Church only, a sufficient Warrant to separate from a Community in such Error*, p. 65. *Which is also confirm'd from some of Mr.* Wall's *own Words*, p. 66. *Agreement in the Fundamentals of Religion, not a sufficient Reason against Separation, as Mr.* Wall *wou'd urge it*, ibid. *Turn'd against himself*, p. 67. *Therefore his Arguments tend to nothing so much as Confusion*, p. 68. *Tho it shou'd be allow'd, that we ought to submit all things purely indifferent, to the Determination of our Superiours; this wou'd make but very little, if at all, in Mr.* Wall's *Favour*, p. 69. *It does not follow, that Persons who think they ought not to renounce Communion for smaller Matters, must therefore constantly conform in those things, and neglect what they think is better*, p. 70. *If the Ceremonys are not of so much Consequence, as to justify the Dissenters in their Separation; neither will they justify the Church in so unnecessarily insisting on 'em*, p. 71. *These things, said to be indifferent in themselves, by being the Occasions of Division, cease to be indifferent, and become unlawful*, p. 72. *The Dissenters are verily persuaded, the things for which they dissent, are not so indifferent as they are pretended*, p. 73. *The Church's Power of making Laws for its own Government, of no service to Mr.* Wall, p. 74. *Things in themselves lawful, may be so circumstantiated, as to become unlawful*, p. 75. *As the Case stands at present, the Dissenters are oblig'd to dissent from the National Church*, ibid. *The uncharitable Obstinacy*

ſtinacy of our Adverſarys, ibid. *The Separation of the Antipædobaptiſts particularly defended*, p. 76. *Mr.* Wall *pretends, that tho they are right, they have no ground to ſeparate*, p. 77. *The Antipædobaptiſt's Notion ſtated*, ibid. *The Time and Manner of receiving Baptiſm, ſo far as it relates to our preſent Diſpute, are Fundamentals*, p. 78. *That can't be true Baptiſm which differs from true Baptiſm*, p. 79. *Our Separation juſtify'd by the Definition of a Church, in the* 19*th Article of the Church of* England, p. 80. *We ought not to unite with Perſons unbaptiz'd*, p. 81. *True Baptiſm neceſſary to Church-Memberſhip*, p. 82. *The Words of the Inſtitution, the beſt Rule to judg what is true Baptiſm*, 83. *We refuſe to communicate with the Church of* England, *for the ſame Reaſon for which ſhe refuſes to communicate with Perſons unbaptiz'd*, ib. *Mr.* Wall's *Terms of Union very partial and unreaſonable*, p. 84. *We are oblig'd to the Toleration for the general Forbearance Mr.* Wall *boaſts of*, p. 85. *And deſire to remain in the Hands of Her Majeſty and Parliament under GOD, who have hitherto ſo kindly ſecur'd us*, ibid. *A fair Propoſal in order to eſtabliſh Unity among us*, p. 86. *Mr.* Wall *a Friend to Perſecutions for Religion*, p. 87. *The Concluſion*, p. 88.

LETTER III.

ANother Inſtance of Mr. Wall's *Unfairneſs*, p. 90. *The Diſpute between the* Engliſh *Pædobaptiſts and us caſt under two Heads*, ibid. *It's ſtrange, things ſo clear ſhou'd be capable of ſo much Diſpute*, p. 91. *So far as the Scriptures are clear, our Practice is allow'd to be exactly agreeable therewith*, ibid. *Therefore if we err, we are, however, on the ſafer ſide*,

ſide, p. 92. *GOD has reveal'd his Will with ſufficient clearneſs, in all material Points*, ibid. *And he has not left it doubtful in what Manner, or to what Subjects Baptiſm ſhould be adminiſtred*, p. 93. *A trifling Remark of Mr.* Wall's *noted*, ibid. *'Tis better not to pretend to baptize Perſons, than not to do it as CHRIST requires it ſhou'd be done*, p. 94. *The* Greek *Word for* baptize *always ſignifys to dip only into any manner of thing*, ibid. *So* Lycophron, p. 95. *And* Sophocles, ibid. *But more commonly, 'tis us'd for dipping into Liquids*, ibid. *So* Homer, p. 96. *Metaphors include and borrow their Beautys from the thing from whence they are taken*, p. 97. Pindar *and his Scholiaſt*, p. 98. Euripides *and his Scholiaſts*, p. 100. Ariſtophanes *in many Places*, p. 101. *The Words in Diſpute frequently apply'd to the Dyers Art*, ibid. *And they colour things by dipping 'em*, p. 102. *Several Paſſages wherein the Word alludes to the Art of Dying, conſider'd*, ibid. *The improper Uſe of Words in metaphorical Paſſages, can't be ſuppos'd to alter their Signification*, p. 105. *Figurative Forms of Speech, are only abbreviated Similes*, p. 106. *'Tis no Objection to ſay, if Words are always literally underſtood, Authors will be made to ſpeak Nonſenſe*, p. 107. *Figurative Sentences not literally true, as they ſtand; but being defective, the Senſe muſt be ſupply'd*, p. 108. *We ſhou'd diſtinguiſh between the Senſe of a Phraſe, as it includes ſome Words not expreſs'd; and the Senſe of the particular Words ſingly conſider'd, juſt as they ſtand*, ibid. *Words have no more than one Signification*, p. 109. *Words are always to be taken in their literal Senſe*, ibid. *The Uſe of theſe Obſervations in the preſent Diſpute*, p. 110. *More Inſtances from* Ariſtophanes, p. 111. πλύνω *is to waſh by dipping*, p. 113. *More Inſtances from* Ariſtotle, p. 115. *From* Heraclides Ponticus, p. 117. *From* Herodotus, ibid. *From* Theocritus, p. 118.

From

From Moſchus, p. 119. *From* Aratus, ibid. *From* Callimachus, p. 120. *From* Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, p. 122. *From* Strabo, p. 123. *From* Plutarch, p. 124. *From* Lucian, p. 125. *From the Emperor* Marcus Antoninus, p. 126. *The Metaphorical Uſe of the Word in diſpute, when apply'd to the Mind, conſider'd and explain'd*, p. 127. *Other Inſtances from* Pollux, p. 129. *From* Themiſtius, ib. *That Lexicographers and Criticks render the Word by* lavo, *is no Argument they ever underſtood it to mean leſs than to* dip, *p.* 130.

LETTER IV.

CRiticks *conſtantly affirm, the proper and genuine Senſe of* βαπτίζω *is* immergo, &c. *p.* 132. *So* Voſſius, Conſtantine, *and* Stephanus *render it*, ibid. *A Teſtimony from* Caſaubon, *p.* 133. *His poor Evaſion*, p. 134. *Another from* Grotius, *p.* 134. *Another from* Dionyſius Petavius, *p.* 135. *'Tis needleſs to collect more*, ibid. *Mr.* Wall *conſcious, notwithſtanding his Pretence, that the Opinions of learned Men are againſt him*, p. 136. *Whereas Mr.* Wall *appeals to the Scriptures for the Senſe of the Word, 'tis ſhewn largely to be never there us'd in his Senſe, but the contrary*, p. 137. Levit. xiv. 6. *conſider'd*, ibid. *That the Word does not always neceſſarily ſignify to dip all over, is the moſt that can be infer'd from it*, p. 138. *Beſides, here it means to dip all over*, p. 139. Iſai. xxi. 4. Ezek. xxiii. 15. Dan. iv. 33. *and* v. 21. *conſider'd*, p. 140, &c. *Hot Climates very dewy*, p. 143. *The* Syriack *Verſion confirms our Senſe*, p. 144. Eccluſ. xxxi. 26. 2 Macc. i. 21. Eccluſ. xxiv. 26. *conſider'd*, p. 145, &c. *The Purification enjoin'd for touching*

touching that which is dead, to be perform'd by Sprinkling, p. 146. *Together with Dipping*, ibid. *The* Mahometans *purify in ſuch Caſes by waſhing all over*, p. 149. *Waſhing was the main part of the Purification among the* Jews, *ibid. For which reaſon the Son of* Syrach *uſes this Word to intend the whole Ceremony*, p. 150. Luke xi. 38. *conſider'd*, p. 152. *Mr.* Wall *pretends the* Jews *always waſh'd their Hands, by having Water pour'd on 'em*, p. 153. *Which is falſe*, p. 150. *The Prieſts waſh'd their Hands and Feet by dipping 'em*, ibid. *Our* LORD *waſh'd his Diſciples Feet ſo likewiſe*, p. 156. *The Authority of the Rabbins not to be depended on*, p. 157. *Dr.* Pocock *allows, the* Jews *were oblig'd ſometimes to waſh by dipping*, p. 158. *And from thence accounts for the uſe of the Word* βαπτίζεσθαι, Mark vii. 4. p. 159. *Mr.* Wall's *next Inſtance, which is* Mark vii. 4. *conſider'd*, p. 162. *They that came from the Market did waſh by dipping*, p. 163. *Sects among the* Jews *who waſh'd themſelves frequently*, p. 164. *The Words may refer to the things brought from the Market*, p. 167. Heb. ix. 10. *and* Matth. xxvi. 23. *conſider'd*, p. 168, &c. *The Sacramental Waſhing being expreſs'd by Words which ſignify any kind of Waſhing, does not prove it may therefore be adminiſter'd by any kind of Waſhing*, p. 172. *Words, like our Ideas, have their* Genera *and* Species, p. 174. *Words of a more particular Senſe ſhou'd explain the more general, and not the contrary*, p. 175.

LETTER V.

TO appeal to the Scriptures only for the Senſe of a Word, very unreaſonable, p. 179. *'Tis notwithſtanding prov'd from them, that the* Greek *Word must*

muſt always ſignify to dip, *p.* 180. *What Paſſages may be argu'd from*, ibid. Luke xvi. 24. *ibid.* John xiii. 26. p. 181. Rev. xix. 13. ibid. *The vulgar Copys have loſt the true Reading in the laſt*, ibid. *Metaphorical Paſſages make for, not againſt my Opinion*, p. 182. *Languages don't exactly anſwer to one another*, p. 184. *If the Word* βαπτίζω *were otherwiſe ever ſo ambiguous, yet as it relates to Baptiſm, 'tis ſufficiently determin'd only and neceſſarily to mean* to dip, *p.* 186. *By the Doctrine and Practice of St.* John, *p.* 187. *Of the holy Apoſtles*, p. 188. *Of the ſucceeding Church for many Centurys, which urg'd a trine Immerſion*, p. 190. *Learned Men in general allow this Mode of Baptiſm*, p. 192. *Mr.* Wall *pretends, tho the Antients did generally baptize by* Immerſion, *they likewiſe us'd* Affuſion, *or the like*, p. 194. *But this was not allow'd in common Caſes*, p. 195. *Aſperſion, how at firſt admitted*, p. 196. *'Tis unreaſonable to argue that the general Senſe of a Law, is the ſame with the Exceptions that are made to it*, p. 197. *The antient Church of the firſt Centurys did not practiſe Affuſion*, &c. *p.* 200. *St.* Cyprian's *Plea for Aſperſion very trifling*, p. 201. *All who were baptiz'd in the Apoſtle's Times, were baptiz'd by Immerſion*, p. 204. *The Clinical Affuſions don't appear to have been introduc'd till about* 250 *Years after* CHRIST, *p.* 206. *At which time, they very much doubted of their Validity*, p. 207. *By the firſt Patrons granted to be preſumptive*, p. 209. *All allow Immerſion was inſiſted on antiently as the only regular way, in all common Caſes at leaſt*, p. 213. *A humble Remark on the Biſhop of* Salisbury's *Plea for changing the manner of adminiſtring the Sacrament here in* England, p. 215. *The Clergy pretend they would gladly revive the antient Practice, but don't take the proper Methods; and in reality obſtruct its being reviv'd*, p. 216. βάπτω *and* βαπτίζω *ſynonymous*, p. 217.

LETTER

The CONTENTS.

LETTER VI.

THE other chief Article in Diſpute between the Baptiſts and their Adverſarys, p. 220. *They continually repeat the moſt trifling Objections, tho they have been fairly anſwer'd over and over*, ibid. *Which has made it neceſſary to ſay a great deal to what has been well enough anſwer'd already, and concerning things which are very plain of themſelves*, ibid. *The late handling of this Controverſy has convinc'd the World, the Baptiſts are not that unreaſonable Sect they were repreſented to be: and 'tis not to be doubted but the reviving the Diſpute at preſent may go far to open Peoples Eyes yet much more in their favour*, ibid. *'Tis pity ſome friendly Meaſures are not taken to compoſe the Difference, which is not ſo impracticable as ſome fancy*, p. 221. *Mr.* Wall's *Attempt, tho the beſt in its kind, falls very ſhort of anſwering the Deſign of it*, ibid. *His Scheme*, ibid. *He firſt allows it cannot be made appear from Scripture, that Infants are to be baptiz'd*, ibid. *And therefore recurs to theſe as the only Expedients: 1. To the Practice of the* Jewiſh *Church: 2. To the Practice of the antient Chriſtians*, p. 222. *Some Reflections which overturn all he ſays as to his main Concluſion, tho he ſhould prove theſe two Points ever ſo ſolidly*, p. 223. *From his Conceſſion, that it cannot be prov'd from Scripture, it unavoidably follows, that 'tis no Inſtitution of* CHRIST, *ibid. And to ſuppoſe it may be included in ſome of the more general Expreſſions, is only to beg the thing in diſpute*, 225. *Unleſs he can ſhew us Infant-Baptiſm is ſo much as mention'd in Scripture, we ſhan't believe it's inſtituted there*, p. 226. *Our Author makes the Scriptures the Rule of Language; which*

which he therefore ought with much more Reaſon to make the only Rule of his Faith and Practice, p. 227. *The Baptiſm of Infants is unlawful if* CHRIST *has not inſtituted it*, ibid. *True Proteſtants ſhou'd adhere to the Scripture, as the only infallible Guide in all religious Controverſys*, p. 229. *They who do otherwiſe, ſeem to be too near the Church of* Rome, *as to the Article of Tradition at leaſt; which is an Inlet to all the reſt*, ibid. *Our Adverſarys act very inconſiſtently in rejecting Tradition, in their Diſputes with the* Romaniſts, *while they recur to it as their main Refuge in the preſent Diſpute with us*, p. 230. *That Infant-Baptiſm ought not to be practis'd, is prov'd from our Author's Principles, compar'd with the Articles of the Church*, ibid. *It gives the* Romaniſts *a Handle to weaken the Reformation with too much Advantage*, p. 231. *The Articles of the Church directly againſt Traditions*, p. 232. *The Scriptures ſilence as good an Argument againſt Pædobaptiſm, as can be deſir'd*, p. 233. *We find a ſtrong Tendency in our Minds to depend upon the Scriptures only*, ibid. *We are oblig'd by any ſort of Law*, &c. *only to the Particulars the ſaid Law expreſſes*, p. 234. *This illuſtrated by Inſtances, and by an undoubted Maxim from* Tertullian, *ibid. Apply'd alſo to the preſent Diſpute, and illuſtrated by more Inſtances*, p. 235. *Some build the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy mainly on that very Foundation on which the baptizing of Infants is oppos'd*, p. 237. *Mr.* Wall *ſometimes argues in the ſame manner as the Baptiſts do againſt Pædobaptiſm*, p. 238. *The Objection, that* CHRIST *no where forbids us to baptize Infants, anſwer'd*, p. 239. *We are forbid to teach the Traditions of Men for Commandments of* GOD, *p.* 240. *The Pædobaptiſts Argument enervated by* Tertullian, *ibid. Tho the Scriptures Silence may ſometimes, it does not always leave it ſo much as lawful to do what it does not mention*, p. 242.

LETTER

The CONTENTS.

LETTER VII.

THat the Scripture does not leave Infant-Baptiſm ſo undetermin'd as ſome wou'd pretend, is largely ſhewn from Matth. xxviii. 19. p. 247. *All Laws equally oblige in all Particulars mention'd in 'em*, ibid. *This apply'd to our preſent Diſpute*, p. 248. *The Commiſſion neceſſarily obliges to teach all it intends ſhou'd be baptiz'd*, p. 249. *Therefore Infants cannot be included in that Commiſſion*, p. 250. *The Commiſſion alſo requires, that all of whom it ſpeaks ſhou'd be firſt taught, and afterwards baptiz'd*, p. 251. *The ridiculous Objection of ſuch as ſay, Infants alſo are to be taught, anſwer'd*, p. 254. *Some wou'd evade its force, by confeſſing, this Commiſſion relates particularly to the Adult; which is directly giving up the Argument*, p. 255. *What the Pædobaptiſts urge from the Words* all Nations, *anſwer'd*, p. 256. *'Tis not ſaid* all of all Nations, *ibid. Illuſtrated by a parallel Inſtance from* Matth. iii. 5, 6. *p.* 257. *Mr.* Dorrington *cenſur'd*, p. 258. *'Tis prov'd, the Commiſſion moſt directly excludes Infants*, ibid. *What the Pædobaptiſts urge concerning the* Greek *Word* Μαθητεύσατε, *anſwer'd*, p. 259. *Dr.* Hammond *cenſur'd for ſo groſly contradicting himſelf in this Point*, ibid. *Men of the greateſt Learning diſown the Criticiſm of the Pædobaptiſts*, p. 260. *A Paſſage from the Biſhop of* Sarum, ibid. *Another from Dr.* Whitby, *p.* 261. Μαθητεύειν *is conſtantly us'd to ſignify nothing leſs than* to teach, *&c.* p. 262. *The Senſe of the Word prov'd from its Etymology*, p. 263. *The Primitive, and all its Derivatives, include* teaching, *&c.* ibid. *No room for an* Antiphraſis, *which is now exploded by the beſt Grammarians*, p. 264. *The*

Pretence from the Termination, that Words in ευω *are to be interpreted by* ſum *in* Latin, *is groundleſs*, ibid. Plutarch *uſes the Word to ſignify* to teach, *p.* 266. *Another Inſtance from St.* Ignatius, *p.* 267. *Another from the ſame*, p. 268. *Another from the ſame*, ibid. *Some from St.* Clemens Alexandrinus, *p.* 269. *One from St.* Juſtin Martyr, *p.* 270. *The Meaning of* εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, p. 271. *Another Inſtance from St.* Juſtin, *p.* 274. *The Word* μαθητεύειν, *even in its ſuppos'd Neuter Acceptation, notwithſtanding the contrary Pretences, always includes* teaching, *ibid.* Matth. xxvii. 57. *conſider'd*, p. 275. *Inſtances wherein the Word ſignifys* to teach, *&c. even when conſtructed with a Dative Caſe, from* Plutarch, *p.* 276. *From* Origen, *p.* 277. *From St.* Irenæus, *expounded by a Paſſage of* Socrates; *and from* Clemens Alexandrinus, *p.* 278. *The true Senſe of the Word farther illuſtrated by ſynonymous Words*, p. 279. *Inſtances of* παιδεύω, *from* Plutarch, *ibid. From* Ælian, *ibid. From* Plato, *p.* 280. *Inſtances of* ἀκόω, *from* Pindar, *ibid. From* Diogenes Laertius, *p.* 281. *From* Plutarch, *ibid. An Inſtance of* διακόω *from* Plutarch, *p.* 282. *A very remarkable Inſtance of the Senſe of* μαθητεύειν, *from* Clemens Alexandrinus, ibid. *Another from the ſame*, p. 284. *One from* Origen, *p.* 285. *Beſides, if what our Adverſarys advance were right, it can be of no Advantage to 'em, becauſe the Word in the Commiſſion is allow'd to be* tranſitive, *p.* 287. *Diſcipleſhip neceſſarily includes teaching*, ibid. Μαθητεύω *means* to teach ſucceſsfully; *and therefore is indeed conſequentially* to make Diſciples, *ibid.*

The CONTENTS.

LETTER VIII.

DR. Hammond *explains* μαθητεύσατε, Matth. xxviii. 19. *by* John iv. 1. *without, if not contrary to all Reaſon*, p. 292. *His Unfairneſs noted*, ibid. *A Paſſage of the Biſhop of* Sarum *in favour of the Antipædobaptiſts Senſe of the Word*, p. 293. *Another from Mr.* Le Clerc, *ibid. What Mr.* Wall *urges from the Notion of a Diſciple, conſider'd*, p. 294. Μαθητὴς *is only ſaid of ſuch as are at leaſt capable of being taught*, ibid. *Mr.* Wall's *groundleſs and unfair Attempt upon* Acts xv. 10. *to prove the contrary, examin'd*, p. 295. *The Words relate only to Adult Perſons*, ibid. *A Diſciple, in common Diſcourſe, ever ſignifys one that's taught*, &c. p. 296. *So it does likewiſe among the* Latin *Authors; from whom we borrow it*, p. 297. *Prov'd from the Etymology of* Diſcipulus, ibid. *By Inſtances from* Cicero, ibid. *From* Juvenal, p. 298. *From* Terence, ibid. *From* Cornel. Nepos, ibid. *All the World have had the ſame Notion of a Diſciple*, ibid. *Inſtances in the* Eaſtern *Languages*, p. 299. *In the* Anglo-Saxon, ibid. *No Inſtance that 'tis us'd otherwiſe in any* Greek *Author, but many of the Senſe the Antipædobaptiſts plead for*, ibid. *One taken from* John ix. 27. ibid. *One from* Acts xviii. 23. ibid. *Another from* Dionyſius Halicarnaſſæus, ibid. *Illuſtrated alſo by ſynonymous Words*, p. 300. *Inſtances of* Ἀκροατὴς, ibid. *From* Diogenes Laertius, ibid. *From* Plutarch, ibid. *An Inſtance of* Ακροώμενος *from* Plutarch, p. 301. *Of* Ἀκροᾶὴς *from* Ælian, ibid. *From* Dionyſius Halicarnaſſæus, ibid. *This illuſtrated by Inſtances from* Roman *Authors*, ibid. *From* Cicero, ibid. *The Inference from all this in the preſent*

ſent Diſpute, p. 302. *A Paſſage from* Lucian, *wherein he explains the Phraſe* to make Diſciples, p. 303. *Diſciple and Teacher us'd as Correlates*, ibid. *By* Themiſtius, p. 304. *By* Cicero, ibid. *This apply'd to the preſent Diſpute*, ibid. *The moſt Judicious have always allow'd, that the Word in the Commiſſion particularly ſignifys to teach and inſtruct*, ibid. *As* Conſtantine, p. 305. Stephens, ibid. Leigh, ibid. Turretine, ibid. Epiſcopius, p. 306. Limborch, p. 307. Cameron, ibid. Martin Bucer, ibid. Rigaltius, p. 308. Eraſmus, ibid. Grotius, ibid. Lucas Brugenſis, p. 309. *This prov'd to be the Senſe of the Place from the ſeveral Verſions*, p. 310. *The* Hebrew, p. 311. Syriack, ibid. Arabick, p. 312. Perſick, ibid. Ethiopick, ibid. Arias Montanus, p. 313. *Vulgar* Latin, ibid. *That of* Sixtus V. ibid. Beza, ibid. Eraſmus, ibid. Caſtalio, ibid. *The* Italian, ibid. Spaniſh, ibid. French, ibid. Dutch, ibid. Daniſh, ibid. Saxon, ibid. *Vulgar* Greek, ibid. *The Fathers of the Primitive Church always underſtood the Word in the Commiſſion ſignify'd to* teach, ibid. *Thus* Clemens Alexandrinus, p. 314. Origen, ibid. *St.* Juſtin, p. 315. Euſebius, 316. Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, ibid. *St.* Clement, ibid. Epiphanius, p. 317. *St.* Baſil, ibid. Tertullian, ibid. Clarus, *Biſhop of* Maſcula, p. 318. *St.* Hierom, ibid. *Laſtly, This is prov'd to be the true Senſe of the Place by the Authority of the Sacred Scriptures themſelves*, p. 319. *The Practice of the Apoſtles*, p. 320. *Parallel Places*, p. 321. *The Sum of the Evidence*, ibid. *From all it follows, that the Commiſſion obliges to teach all that are to be baptiz'd: and therefore that the Scriptures are not ſo ſilent concerning the Baptizing of Infants as the Pædobaptiſts wou'd have us think*, ibid. *So that if Mr.* Wall *ſhou'd prove the* Jews *and* Chriſtians *did baptize their Children, we have ſtill reaſon enough not to admit the Practice*, p. 322.

The CONTENTS.

LETTER IX.

MR. Wall's *Attempt founded on Miſtake*, p. 324 *His Pretences from the* Jews *examin'd: which he has collected from the Learned Men who beſt underſtood their Writings*, p. 325. *Their Authority of no weight: the Reaſons they go upon being too weak*, ibid. *'Tis without ſufficient ground that our Author aſſerts, the* Jews *make it plain they baptiz'd their Proſelytes before* CHRIST's *time*, ibid. *His Authoritys too late*, p. 326. *Great Alterations introduc'd in a ſhort time*, p. 327. *The Paſſages produc'd by Mr.* Wall *don't ſo much as intimate that the* Jews *baptiz'd Proſelytes in our* SAVIOUR's *time*, p. 328. *There is no neceſſity to underſtand the Words in Mr.* Wall's *Senſe*, ibid. *The* Jews *us'd to baptize for the Pollution contracted in Circumciſion: which may be the Baptiſm ſpoken of in the* Talmud, p. 329. *Some of the* Rabbins *plainly ſhew us they neither knew nor allow'd of any initiatory Baptiſm*, ibid. *They ridicule our Baptiſm as a fanciful Ceremony, as appears from the antient* Nizzachon, *which fixes the riſe of the Practice in* CHRIST, *and mentions it as an Initiation peculiar to Chriſtians; and oppoſes to it the* Jewiſh *Circumciſion only*, p. 330. *It appears farther from* Rab. Iſaac, p. 332. *So that the* Jewiſh *Writings, if any thing, prove contrary to our Author's Opinion*, p. 333. *The Authority of the* Rabbins *very inſignificant, and never to be depended on*, p. 334. *Their Writings in general ſtuff'd with very fooliſh Romantic Tales*, p. 335. *Their fabulous and ridiculous way of accounting for* CHRIST's *Power of Miracles, from* Toldoth Jeſchu, ibid. *More Inſtances of their ridiculous Whimſys from the* Talmud, p. 338. *Their fooliſh*

fooliſh Miſapplication of Scripture, p. 340. *Their impious Repreſentations of* GOD, p. 342. *A fabulous Account of the Origin of* Rome, p. 343. *Another concerning* R. Eliezar, *in Confirmation of their Traditions*, ibid. *The* Pirke *of* Eliezar, p. 344. *Another Reaſon why the* Rabbins *are not to be rely'd on is, that they profeſs to follow their Doctors in all they aſſert, tho ever ſo abſurd*, p. 345. *They prefer their* Talmud *and* Traditions *before the Scriptures themſelves*, ibid. *The Character of the* Rabbins, p. 346. *Their exceſſive Pride*, ibid. *Their way of interpreting the Scriptures*, p. 347. *The Sanhedrim, tho made up of their beſt Men, conſiſted only of Magicians, as themſelves aſſert*, &c. ibid. *They have endeavour'd to corrupt the Scriptures*, p. 348. *All learned Men give the ſame Character of the* Jews, *and their Writings*, p. 349. *So Mr.* Le Clerc, ibid. *Mr.* Du Pin, ibid. *Mr.* Dodwell, ibid. Scaliger, p. 350. Naucle-rus, ibid. Buxtorf, ibid. Lightfoot, p. 351. *And the ſame Character is given of 'em by* CHRIST *himſelf too, who cenſures 'em more particularly on account of their Waſhings*, ibid. *Their Traditions were many and miſchievous*, p. 352. *All theſe things apply'd to the preſent Diſpute*, ibid.

LETTER X.

ARrian, *from whom Mr.* Wall *next argues, too late to determine the Matter*, p. 355. *He may perhaps only ſpeak of the Purifications for Pollutions*, ibid. *The* Pagans *frequently confounded the* Jews *and Chriſtians together, as appears from* Themiſtius, p. 357. *From* Arrian *himſelf*, p. 359. *From* Lucian, p. 361. *From* Tacitus, ibid. *From* Suetonius, ibid. *And* Rigaltius *underſtands* Arrian's *Words ſo too*, p. 362. *As do alſo* Petavius, Lipſius, *and* Barthius, ibid.

Mr.

Mr. Wall's *Argument from* Gregory Nazianzen *examin'd*, p. 363. *This Father liv'd too late to determine our Diſpute; and does not ſpeak of an initiatory Baptiſm*, p. 364. *The Scripture makes no mention of an initiatory Baptiſm in uſe among the* Jews, p. 365. Exod. xix. 10. *makes nothing to the Purpoſe*, ibid. Maimonides, *his Rule of Interpretation falſe*, p. 367. *The* Rabbins *very bad Interpreters*, p. 368. Sanctify *does not neceſſarily imply waſhing*, ibid. *Nothing in the Words which ſo much as intimates the Body was to be waſh'd*, p. 369. *There is no mention of an initiatory Baptiſm in any authentic antient Hiſtory; even tho they had the faireſt Occaſions, and ought not to have omitted it, if there had been any ſuch Uſage*, p. 370. *This illuſtrated by ſome Inſtances from* Joſephus *and* Ganz, *ibid. 'Tis on many Accounts very improbable that the* Jews *had any ſuch Ceremony*, p. 371. *Prov'd from St.* Paul's *Words*, ibid. *From* Gregory Nazianzen, p. 372. *From St.* Peter, ibid. *Several Authors of Reputation, and eſpecially the Antients, do in effect deny they knew of any initiatory Baptiſm among the* Jews, ibid. *Thus St.* Barnabas, p. 373. Juſtin Martyr, p. 374. Tertullian, p. 376. Origen, p. 377. *St.* Cyril *of* Jeruſalem, ibid. *Many Writers ſay our Baptiſm came inſtead (not of Baptiſm among the* Jews, *but) of Sacrifice; as the* Recognitions, p. 378. *Or of the Waſhings for Pollutions, as the* Apoſtolical Conſtitutions *pretend*, ibid. *And Mr.* Hill *ſpeaks to this Purpoſe*, p. 379. *Others more commonly ſay it ſucceeds in the Place of Circumciſion*, ibid. *The Concluſion from theſe Obſervations*, p. 380. *Tho the* Jews *cou'd be prov'd to have baptiz'd their Proſelytes, this does no ſervice to the Cauſe of Pædobaptiſm*, ibid. *For*, 1. *It does not appear that Infants were admitted*, ibid. 2. *If the* Jews *had ſuch a Baptiſm as is pretended, it is no Rule to Chriſtians: otherwiſe the* Socinians, *&c. have a good handle to lay aſide the Uſe of Baptiſm*, ibid. *And there is*

no manner of Analogy between the Jewiſh, *and the* Chriſtian *Pædobaptiſm*, p. 382. 3. *We need only go back to the Baptiſm of St.* John; *which there is more reaſon to think was the Pattern of* CHRIST's *than a* Jewiſh *Ceremony*, p. 383. *St.* John, CHRIST, *and his Apoſtles baptiz'd no Infants*, ibid. *A Paſſage of* Joſephus *to this purpoſe*, p. 384. *Another from* Origen, p. 385. *Another of St.* Paul, ibid. 4. *At beſt this ſuppos'd Baptiſm of the* Jews *is only a Traditionary Ceremony from the* Rabbins, p. 386. *Their quoting Texts for it no proof of its divine Inſtitution*, ibid. *The* Rabbins *don't pretend to find an initiatory Baptiſm in the Scriptures*, ibid. *But confeſs it is only a Tradition of their Elders*, p. 387. *This prov'd from the Words of the* Talmud, ibid. *Which are explain'd by ſome Rules of* Maimonides, ibid. Exod. xix. 10. *cited only by way of Accommodation*, p. 390. *'Tis therefore great Preſumption to draw a* Rabbinical *Tradition into a Precedent for the Chriſtian Church*, p. 391. *Theſe things apply'd to the preſent Diſpute*, ibid. *The Concluſion*, ibid.

LETTER XI.

WHAT *is to be the particular Buſineſs of the following Letters*, p. 395. *The Authority of the Primitive Fathers more to be valu'd than* Daillé, *and ſome others ſuppoſe*, ibid. *'Twou'd be eaſy to defend the Credit of the Fathers from the Cavils of theſe Men*, p. 396. *They were, doubtleſs, faithful in the Relations they were well qualify'd to give of Affairs in their own Churches and Times*, ibid. *And ſo far their Authority is of Conſequence*, ibid. *But yet this is not ſufficient to ground Mr.* Wall's *Attempt upon, tho they ſhou'd afford ever ſo many full Citations*, ibid.

They were ſometimes in the wrong, p. 397. *The two only ways to prove Infant-Baptiſm are inſufficient, even tho the Arguments our Adverſarys make uſe of be allow'd all the Force they are pretended to have*, p. 398. *'Tis probable, the earlieſt Churches practis'd only what they receiv'd from the Apoſtles*, ibid. *Mr.* Wall *takes no notice of St.* Barnabas, *becauſe he makes againſt Infant-Baptiſm in ſeveral Places*, p. 400. *The Paſſages from St.* Clement *examin'd*, p. 401. *Mr.* Wall's *Argument from 'em ſtated*, p. 402. *The main Point on which it turns a groundleſs Miſtake*, viz. *that Baptiſm is neceſſary univerſally to all that ſhall be ſav'd*, p. 403. *Baptiſm does not appear to have been deſign'd to waſh away Original Sin*, ibid. *By this ſame Argument, it might as certainly be prov'd, that all the Antipædobaptiſts now are for Infant-Baptiſm*, p. 404. *The Paſſages from* Hermas *conſider'd*, p. 405. *In the Paſſages cited, this Father ſpeaks only of Adult Perſons*, ibid. John iii. 5. *conſider'd*, p. 408. Kingdom of *GOD does not neceſſarily mean the Kingdom of Glory*, p. 410. *The Words cannot be taken univerſally*, p. 412. *'Tis has no relation to Infants in any Place of Scripture*, p. 413. *And here relates only to the Subjects of whom our LORD ſpeaks*, p. 414. *Who are only Adult Perſons who have heard the Word preach'd*, ibid. *As appears*, 1. *Becauſe ſuch only can be expected to comply with the Inſtitution, to whom only it is truly given*, p. 415. 2. *Becauſe ſuch only can be ſav'd by it, according to St.* Peter, p. 416. *Whoſe Words the Pædobaptiſts have never yet fairly interpreted*, ibid. *Dr.* Whitby's *Evaſion conſider'd*, p. 417. 3. *The ſame Form of Speech uſual, when Infants are not included*, p. 418. *As they ſeem not to be in this place, by our SAVIOUR's Words in the Context*, p. 420. 4. *The Words under Conſideration cannot be true of Infants*, p. 421. 5. *Something in the Words themſelves limits 'em to Adult Perſons*, ibid. *What it is to be born of the SPIRIT*, p. 422.

p. 422. *Dr.* Whitby's *judicious Obſervations on the Text*, p. 423. *Another Paſſage of* Hermas *conſider'd*, ibid. *He only deſcribes Viſions, and therefore is not always to be taken literally*, p. 424. *He cannot mean, that Perſons in their ſeparate State were or cou'd be baptiz'd with material Water*, p. 425. *He ſays nothing however of Infant-Baptiſm; but rather excludes Infants in this very Paſſage*, p. 426. *Beſides, to give up all our Adverſarys can reaſonably deſire here, it wou'd only prove Infants ſhall be baptiz'd in their ſeparate Eſtate after Death, which is nothing to our Diſpute*, p. 427. *Another Paſſage of* Hermas, p. 428. *That Infants are eſteem'd of GOD, no Argument they ought to be baptiz'd*, ibid. *This Paſſage makes rather againſt Infant-Baptiſm*, p. 429. Hermas *ſays ſeveral things inconſiſtent with it*, ibid. Matth. xix. 14. *conſider'd*, p. 430. *It has no relation to Baptiſm*, ibid. *Dr.* Whitby's *Improvement of the Paſſage examin'd*, p. 431. *'Tis probable the Children were brought to be heal'd*, ibid. *It does not follow from theſe Words, that they are fit to be dedicated to CHRIST by Baptiſm*, p. 432. *The Biſhop of* Salisbury's *Aſſertion noted, and diſprov'd*, p. 433. *Concluſion*, p. 435.

LETTER XII.

WHat *Mr.* Wall *produces from the Writings of the ſecond Century, examin'd*, p. 439. *A Paſſage in St.* Juſtin *conſider'd*, ibid. *Which makes nothing for Infant-Baptiſm*, ibid. *Neither does it ſpeak of Original Sin, as our Author pretends*, p. 440. *Mr.* Wall *has perverted the Words*, ibid. *His Tranſlation of 'em unintelligible*, ibid. Ἀπὸ τὸ Ἀδὰμ *means from* Adam, p. 441. *Another Miſconſtruction noted*, p. 442. *The Phraſe explain'd by a Paſſage in* Dionyſius Halicarnaſſæus, *ibid. And another*

another in Thucydides, p. 443. *Another Paſſage from St.* Juſtin *conſider'd*, ibid. *He does not call Baptiſm Circumciſion*, p. 444. *He cou'd not mean Baptiſm by the ſpiritual Circumciſion he ſpeaks of*, ib. *What he underſtands by ſpiritual Circumciſion*, ibid. *Other Writers of the Primitive Church talk in the ſame manner*, p. 447. Coloſſ. ii. 11, 12, *conſider'd*, p. 448. *The Scripture no where calls Baptiſm Circumciſion*, ibid. *The Words in themſelves are not capable of the Senſe our Adverſarys give 'em*, p. 449. *The Antients did not call Baptiſm the Circumciſion without Hands, as Mr.* Wall *pretends*, p. 451. *Mr.* Wall's *Argument from the Parallel between Circumciſion and Baptiſm, ſhewn to be groundleſs*, ibid. *The Principle on which 'tis founded, evidently falſe*, p. 452. *Some of the Conſequences of it: as that Baptiſm muſt be adminiſter'd only on the eighth Day*, ibid. *That Females muſt not be baptiz'd*, p. 453. *As the Apoſtles did not make Circumciſion their Rule in relation to Baptiſm; ſo neither ſhou'd we*, ibid. *Another Paſſage from St.* Juſtin, p. 454. *'Tis not to be imagin'd he ſhou'd forbear to mention Infant-Baptiſm, if it had been then practis'd*, ibid. *Or however, he ought not to have ſpoken ſo as is inconſiſtent with that Practice*, p. 455. *The Paſſage is directly againſt Infant-Baptiſm*, p. 456. *The Reaſons why Mr.* Wall *cites this Paſſage; tho he confeſſes it makes nothing for Infant-Baptiſm*, p. 457. *The firſt Reaſon makes againſt him*, ibid. *His next Reaſon, that Regeneration is put for Baptiſm, groundleſs*, p. 458. *St.* Juſtin *never underſtands Regeneration ſo*, ibid. *Baptiſm not Regeneration, but the Symbol of it*, p. 459. *The third Reaſon contradicts his former Aſſertion*, p. 460. *Another Paſſage from St.* Juſtin, *ibid. Which Mr.* Wall *draws to his ſide by a very unfair Tranſlation*, p. 461. Ἐκ παίδων *ſignifys* from their Childhood, *ibid. Illuſtrated by Inſtances from* Cicero, *p.* 462. *From* Laertius, *ibid. From* Plato, *ibid. From* Plutarch,

tarch, *ibid.* *From* Origen, *ibid.* *From* Theophilus Antiochenus, *p.* 463. *From the Scriptures*, ibid. *Mr.* Wall *himſelf tranſlates a Paſſage of St.* Baſil *thus on another Occaſion*, p. 464. *The famous Paſſage from St.* Irenæus *conſider'd*, ibid. *'Tis not genuine*, p. 465. *Cardinal* Baronius *obſerves, the latter part of the Chapter contradicts the beginning*, *ibid.* Petavius's *Anſwer to this proves nothing*, p.466. *The Author of the laſt part of the Chapter attempts to confirm a manifeſt Falſhood, by the Authority of the Antients from St.* John, *which St.* Irenæus *cou'd never have done*, ibid. *Mr.* Dodwell's *Pretence, that St.* John, *&c. judg'd of our* LORD's *Age by his Countenance, too weak, and groundleſs*, p. 467. *They cou'd not but know the time of our* LORD's *Birth more exactly*, ibid. *St.* Irenæus *cou'd not think* CHRIST *arriv'd to near ſo much as his* 40*th Year: the contrary being ſo evident from the Cenſual Rolls then in being, and from the Diſputes with the Adverſarys of the Chriſtian Religion*, p. 470. *Nay, it appears from St.* Irenæus's *own Words, that he was not in ſo groſs an Error*, p. 471. *He fixes the time of the* LORD's *Birth*, ibid. *The time of his Paſſion computed: From the time of* Pontius Pilate's *Government, and* Tiberius's *Reign*, ibid. *From the Deſtruction of* Jeruſalem, *&c.* p. 472. *Mr.* Dodwell's *Attempt to excuſe the Extravagance of this ſpurious Paſſage, wholly uſeleſs*, p. 475. *Beſides, the Paſſage is taken only from a very bad Tranſlation, as learned Men confeſs, viz.* Scaliger, *p.* 476. Du Pin, *ibid.* *Mr.* Dodwell, p. 477. *Dr.* Grabe, *ibid.* *This may alſo appear, by comparing it with the remaining Fragments of the Original*, ibid. *Again, the Word* Regenerated *in this Paſſage, does not mean Baptiz'd*, p. 480. *The* Jews *did not give Riſe to this way of ſpeaking*, p. 481. *The Scripture Notion of Regeneration*, p. 482. John iii. 5. *conſider'd*, p. 483. *The Regeneration there mention'd, conſiſts in the Operations*

tions of the Spirit, of which Baptiſm is the Sign and Seal, ibid. *And this appears from our* LORD's *own Words following,* p. 484. Titus iii. 5. *conſider'd,* p. 486. *That the Antients never mean Baptiſm, but an internal Change by Regeneration, ſhewn from* Clemens Alexandrinus, *p.* 490. Tertullian, *ibid.* Origen, *p.* 492. Clemens Romanus, *p.* 493. *St.* Barnabas, *ibid. And St.* Irenæus *no where uſes the Word, as our Author pretends he always does,* p. 494. *The Inference from theſe Obſervations,* p. 498. *A Contradiction of Mr.* Wall's, *ibid. Another Exception to the Paſſage cited from St.* Irenæus, *is, that* Infantes *does not neceſſarily mean ſuch young Children as the Pædobaptiſts admit to Baptiſm,* p. 499. Omnis Ætas *does not always include Infants,* ibid. *As appears by an Inſtance from St.* Cyprian, *ibid. The* Recognitions, *p.* 500. Dionyſius *of* Alexandria, ibid. *Nor does the Enumeration of the ſeveral Ages make it neceſſary to underſtand ſuch Infants as are not capable of Reaſon,* ibid. *Infancy, according to St.* Irenæus *himſelf, reaches to ten Years of Age,* p. 501. *As Mr.* Dodwell *alſo thinks,* p. 502. *The Inference,* ibid. *Perſons under Ten, capable of Inſtruction and Baptiſm,* p. 503. *Recapitulation and Concluſion,* ibid.

LETTER XIII.

AN *Argument againſt Infant-Baptiſm, drawn from* Polycrates's *Letter to* Victor, *p.* 507. Tertullian *no Friend to Infant-Baptiſm; which makes Mr.* Wall *begin his Citations from him, with decrying his Authority,* p. 508. *His general Expreſſions no Argument for Pædobaptiſm,* ibid. Tertullian's ſteddy Meaning *is eaſy to be come at, without Mr.* Wall's *extravagant Gueſſes,* p. 509. Tertullian's *mentioning Infant-*

Infant-Baptiſm, no Argument it was practis'd in his time, but only that ſome were endeavouring to bring in the Practice, p. 510. Tertullian *does not ſimply adviſe (as Mr.* Wall *pretends) to defer the baptizing of Children, but argues againſt it, as a thing that ought not to be done*, p. 511. *The reading of the Paſſage on which Mr.* Wall *grounds his Suppoſition, altogether impertinent and abſurd*, ibid. Tertullian's *Doctrine concerning Baptiſm, inconſiſtent with Pædobaptiſm*, p. 512. *His Expoſition of* 1 Cor. vii. 14. *not in favour of Pædobaptiſm*, p. 513. *Not one Author of the firſt three Centurys, who underſtands that Text of Baptiſm*, ibid. *Mr.* Wall's *Endeavours to prove that* ἁγιος, &c. *mean waſh'd*, &c. *ineffectual*, p. 514. *The Senſe given by the Biſhop of* Sarum, *and Dr.* Whitby, *cannot be the true one*, p. 515. *The beſt Interpretation which can be made upon our Author's own Principles, is what he ſo much deſpiſes*, viz. *that by Holineſs is meant Legitimacy*, p. 516. *This prov'd to be the true Senſe*, p. 517. Holy *never ſignifys* baptiz'd, *ibid. When Mr.* Wall *comes to* Origen, *he cites ſome Paſſages which are plain to his Purpoſe*, p. 519. *But they are only taken from* Latin *Tranſlations*, ibid. *The Paſſage ſome cite from the* Greek *Remains of this Father, (as Mr.* Wall *himſelf confeſſes) proves nothing*, ibid. *The* Latin *Tranſlations from whence the main Citations are taken, are very corrupt and licentious*, p. 521. *Several learned Men confeſs it*, ibid. *As* Grotius, p. 522. Huetius, *ibid.* Daillé, *ibid.* Du Pin, *ibid.* Tarinus, p. 523. *Which is alſo abundantly prov'd, by comparing the Tranſlation with the* Greek *Fragments, as now extant*, ibid. *St.* Hierom *was not more faithful in his Tranſlations than* Ruffinus, p. 524. *'Tis very probable they took this liberty in all other things, as well as in thoſe particularly for which* Origen *was queſtion'd*, ibid. Ruffinus, *notwithſtanding what Mr.* Wall *ſays to the contrary, took as much liberty with*

the Epiſtle to the Romans *as he did with other Books*, p. 525. *He expreſly ſays, he had added many things*, p. 526. *Beſides, that Commentary was very much interpolated before* Ruffinus *took it in hand*, p. 527. *As to the Paſſage taken out of the Homilys on* Joſhua, *it's at beſt doubtful whether he ſpeaks of Infants in Age*, ibid. *In one part of theſe Homilys he has inſerted, tho it be not in the Original, this Paſſage particularly, which is the Ground of the Pædobaptiſts Argument*, p. 528. *In St.* Cyprian's *time Infant-Baptiſm was practis'd in* Africa; *and probably firſt took riſe there, together with Infant-Communion*, ibid. *The* Africans, *generally Men of weak Underſtanding*, p. 529. *The* Greek *Church, probably, had not yet admitted the Error*, ibid. *The Inference from the whole*, p. 530. *A Recapitulation*, ibid. *A Reaſon why ſo much only of Mr.* Wall's *Hiſtory as relates to the firſt Centurys, is examin'd*, p. 541. *How Infant-Baptiſm was at firſt brought in uſe*, p. 542. *Errors ſprung up in the Church very early*, ibid. *This of Infant-Baptiſm not brought in all at once, but by degrees*, p. 543. *And was occaſion'd in ſome meaſure by their Zeal, which was not always according to Knowledg, as ſeveral other things were*, ibid. *A Parallel betwixt this Practice and the Popiſh Notion of Tranſubſtantiation*, ibid. *When* John iii. 5. *was underſtood to relate to Infants, as well as others, no wonder Infants were baptiz'd*, p. 545. *Upon juſt ſuch another Miſtake of our* SAVIOUR's *Words in* John vi. 53. *the earlieſt Pædobaptiſts admitted Children to the* LORD's *Supper*, p. 546. *Concluſion*, ibid.

ERRATA.

ERRATA.

PAg. 14. Lin. 26. dele *one*. P. 23. l. 24. for Liturgy, read *Lethargy*. P. 35. l. 6. r. he assures *us* also: and l. 11. r. he is *in* no, &c. P. 42. l. 29. r. *Is it not very strange* that, &c. P. 44. l. 27. r. καλατίθενλαι. P. 95. l. 22. for *p.* r. *v.* P. 97. l. 17. r. as *if* it, &c. Ibid. not. lin. 1. r. ἀπὸ τῶ. P. 107. l. 33. r. *which seem to be* us'd, &c. P. 131. l. 14. for xxv. r. xxiii. P. 134. not. l. 5. r. *eo*. P. 137. not. l. 3. for chap. vi. r. chap. xiv. 6. Ibid. l. 4. for 1 Kings r. 1 *Sam.* Ibid. l. 5. for 8. r. 7. P. 141. l. 11. for xxv. r. xxiii. P. 149. l. 29. r. *Numb.* vi. 9. P. 156. l. 1. r. 2 *Kings* iii. 11. P. 162. l. 5. r. *the* Words. Ibid. l. penult. r. xi. 32. P. 176. l. 19. dele *not therefore*. P. 180. l. 14. r. since *'tis*. P. 209. l. 29. r. *safest*. P. 210. l. 9. r. had *not*. P. 228. l. 1. for 16. r. 6. P. 272. l. 23. for Faith r. *Belief*. P. 290. l. 26. for Laertius, r. *Plutarch*. P. 312. l. 10. dele *to*. P. 354. l. 17. for the, r. *this*. Ibid. l. 34. r. *Paul*. P. 377. l. 28. for xxix. r. xxx. P. 460. l. 5. r. 38.

REFLECTIONS

On Mr. WALL's History of

Infant-Baptism.

LETTER I.

Heats among Christians inconsistent with their Profession, and a great Dishonour to Christianity. This Reflection occasion'd by a Letter the Author receiv'd, very unbecoming the Character of his Friend that sent it. The Author endeavours to find an Excuse for his Friend. We are generally more subject to Passion in Matters of Religion, than in other Things. His Friend's great Respect to the Power of the Church of England, *which he thinks to be the best constituted* National *Church in the World, some sort of Excuse for him. We have no infallible Judg on Earth. Nothing can excuse unreasonable Excesses of any kind. Hard Names,* &c. *no real Prejudice to our Cause. Mr.* Wall's *Moderation only pretended. The Antipædobaptists hearty Friends to the present Government. Those who make the greatest Outcries of the Church's Danger, known to be her greatest Enemies. Persecution for Religion, directly contrary to our* SAVIOUR's *Doctrine and Example. Arguments from Scripture the proper Means to convince Men.*

The Antipædobaptiſts open to Inſtruction. Mr. Wall's *Hiſtory not ſo formidable as is pretended. He is not much to be depended on. His real Aim and Deſign was only to eſtabliſh the Baptiſm of Infants; as appears by conſidering his Pretence from* Juſtin Martyr. *Another from St.* Cyprian. *Another from the* Apoſtolical Conſtitutions. *He takes all Occaſions to blacken the Antipædobaptiſts; diſguiſing his Deſigns with Pretences to Moderation. This Charge not inconſiſtent with Charity. Learned Men are beſt able to judg of Matters. Mr.* Wall *endeavours to poſſeſs his Readers with an Opinion of his Learning, by ſeveral needleſs Digreſſions, on the* Decretal Epiſtles. *On the Hiſtory of* Pelagianiſm; *and, in this, on the Lawfulneſs of Oaths, and poſſeſſing Riches. On the Virginity of our* Lord's *Mother. On the* Socinians, *and the* Tritheiſm *they charge on the Fathers. This a Subject too difficult for Mr.* Wall. *His ridiculous Reflection on Mr.* Stennett *noted. Another Artifice to gain Reputation, by quarrelling with ſeveral of the greateſt Men for Learning,* &c. *As Archbiſhop* Tillotſon, *Biſhop* Burnet, Rigaltius, Gregory Nazianzen, *Father and Son; St.* Chryſoſtom, *Mr.* Le Clerc. *Difference in Opinion, no warrant to diſpenſe with the Rules of Charity. Moral Vertues more acceptable to* God, *than Speculative Notions. Mr.* Le Clerc *no* Arian, Photinian, *or* Socinian. *Mr.* Wall *alſo quarrels with* Grotius. *The Senſe of a Paſſage in St.* Gregory *ſet right, which Mr.* Wall *had miſrepreſented. The Senſe of a Canon of the* Neocæſarian *Council reſcu'd from the Force Mr.* Wall *put upon it: As alſo, the Words of* Zonaras *and* Balſamon, *in relation thereto. St.* Auſtin *and* Pelagius *ſpeak of the End, not of the Subjects of Baptiſm. He that takes ſo much Liberty with ſuch Men, will take more, in all probability, with the Antipædobaptiſts. Mr.* Wall *has not acted the Part of a faithful Hiſtorian towards us.*

us. He several times, on no ground at all, takes for granted some Things merely because they favour his Design. And charges the Antipædobaptists with whatever he has heard any one among 'em to have believ'd or said.

SIR,

ONE wou'd think it impossible, when we consider the perfect Charity and Moderation which Christianity every where recommends, to find its Professors so overcome with Bitterness and Heat. 'Tis a great Reflection on our holy Religion, and nothing hardly can expose it to Jest and Banter more than these Animosities and violent Divisions, which reign among those who make the highest Pretences of Affection to it; who after having magnify'd it to others, and endeavour'd to convince 'em of its Excellence and Truth, so foully contradict its Piety and Goodness in their Actions, which are so directly opposite to that Divine SPIRIT which breath'd it forth: which discovers they have no such great opinion of it themselves, and gives the Enemys of our Faith but too much colour to cry it down as an Imposture, and an Invention of State, to frighten Children and Fools into Subjection and Slavery. Rage and Fury are inconsistent with Christianity; and where these govern, that can find no place: For, what Agreement can there be between a persecuting Temper, and the peaceful Spirit of CHRIST our LORD? *What Communion hath Light with Darkness? What Concord hath* CHRIST *with Belial?* &c. 2 Cor. vi. *v.* 14, 15. And accordingly, 'tis to be observ'd, no Party encourages this fiery Zeal so much, as the most Antichristian of all Churches, *viz.* that of *Rome.*

You will eaſily apprehend, Sir, the Occaſion of theſe Reflections; for give me leave to tell you, nothing cou'd be more unbecoming your Character, either as a Chriſtian, or a Learned Man, than the Letter you ſent me. I ſhou'd never have expected it from one of but tolerable Senſe and Candor; and much leſs from you, who are a Perſon of uncommon Abilitys, and a liberal Education.

I can't tell how to expreſs the Surprize I was in, that you, of all my Friends, ſhou'd dip your Pen ſo deep in Gall, and treat us with ſo much ſeeming Ill-nature; and I was the more concern'd, becauſe I cou'd think of nothing which might excuſe you. 'Tis, indeed, what I never obſerv'd in you before, during our long Acquaintance; but this only increaſes the preſent Wonder: and I can't imagine what Provocation you had to it now, unleſs, perhaps, ſomething extraordinary had chaf'd you; and turning your Thoughts, in the Commotion, upon the unhappy Difference between us, you were betray'd into this Warmth unawares.

And 'tis our Misfortune, indeed, that in Matters of Religion, where we ſhou'd ſhew the leaſt, we generally have the greateſt Paſſion: Here our Nature is more apt to take Fire; and we think it juſtifiable too, or rather our Duty; cheating our ſelves with falſe Pretences to a Zeal for God and Religion: for all things that are comprehended under that venerable Name, juſtly make a deep Impreſſion on our Souls, and touch their moſt ſenſible Part. From theſe Conſiderations, I ſhou'd be glad to frame an Excuſe for you; and to give it the greater weight, I add farther on your Behalf, that not being a *Divine*, you have not made it your Buſineſs to examine the Controverſy thorowly, but have taken it on Truſt

Trust from the Clergy, as I fear they do too often from one another.

This, I own, is but an indifferent Plea; yet I'm willing it shou'd pass with my self, for I wou'd fain find something which might be stretch'd into an Excuse for a Person I so much esteem. And, indeed, to one that knows you, it will not seem altogether unlikely, that this was the Cause. The Deference and Respect you pay to the Church of *England*, and its Governors and Customs, is undoubtedly very commendable, and no small Argument of a devout Mind: especially considering how much you are persuaded that CHRIST has left many Things, even all that are indifferent, in the Church's Power; and that therefore all ought to obey, and intirely submit to that Power and Authority, with which it is thus by him invested. And as to the Church of *England* in particular, I know you look upon her to be, by far, the purest and best constituted National Church in the World, and very conformable to the primitive Pattern, both in respect to the Holiness of her Doctrines and the Usefulness of her Discipline, as establish'd in the Canons and Constitutions of the Church: and that she eminently enjoys what is made a distinguishing Character by CHRIST Himself, in that she preserves an extensive Charity; and is in her Nature an utter Stranger, let some of her pretended Sons be what they will, to those Tyrannical Principles, which are the Support of her Antichristian Neighbours: And all the World owns, none can boast of a more learned Clergy, to maintain the Interest of our most holy Religion. Now these things are, doubtless, enough to create a just Veneration in you, for the Authority and Judgment of such Guides; and therefore I don't wonder that you apply to 'em the

Apoſtle's awful Charge, 1 *Cor.* iv. 1. *Let a Man ſo account of 'em, as of the Miniſters of Chriſt, and Stewards of the Myſterys of God.*

I am ſollicitous, you ſee, Sir, to excuſe the Fault I think you have committed; and have ſet down my Thoughts juſt as they came to Mind, that you may perceive, by their Diſorder, how much I am concern'd. But after all, I muſt obſerve, that having no infallible Judg on Earth, we are not blindly to proſtitute our Conſciences to the Dictates of any Power whatever, but have an undiſputed Right to that *Liberty wherewith* CHRIST *has made us free.*

'Tis an unpleaſing Reflection, becauſe it ſo much weakens the Force of what I have been contriving in your excuſe; but ſtill I can't forbear thinking, that nothing will by any means juſtify a raſh Unchriſtian Conduct. Religion, which is the higheſt Reaſon, can be no Excuſe for unreaſonable Exceſſes of any kind; and therefore whoever engages in the defence of a Party with the uſual Violence, you may be ſatisfy'd, and may take it for a general Rule, has not his Zeal from Religion, but ſomething which lies at bottom, of a quite contrary nature. And this your own Experience muſt needs have confirm'd to you.

However, if thro the Miſrepreſentations of others, you are perſuaded to think ſo ill of us, and believe you have treated us as well, or it may be better than we deſerve; I only beg you wou'd let me know the Reaſons on which this ill Opinion of us is grounded, and I will promiſe impartially to conſider 'em: and if they have any Weight, I'll ingenuouſly acknowledg it, and give up my Cauſe. But till I can ſee ſomething more concluſive than what Mr. *Wall*, or any elſe I have yet met with, have offer'd, I muſt deſire you will allow me to continue my Separation from the

the National Church, and religiously adhere to that more despis'd one, of which, I hope, I shall never be asham'd or afraid to own my self a Member.

We are very little mov'd at the Reflections and hard Names you bestow on us, whatever Force you may think there is in 'em. *Conceited Sectarys*, and *Obstinate Hereticks*, are old Calumnys. St. *Paul* himself did not escape 'em, and has taught us to confess, that *after the way which* some *call Heresy, so worship we the* GOD *of our Fathers*, Acts xxiv. 14. 'Tis no real Prejudice to our Cause that it is ridicul'd, and the conscientious Professors of it vilify'd and abus'd. CHRIST and His whole Doctrine, while He was on Earth, and a long time after, was not better treated; and His great Example, we thank GOD, has encourag'd us to endure all manner of Reproaches for His sake with Patience: we know, and He bid us remember it in the Times of Trouble, that we who are Servants, are not greater than our Lord and Master. We can never forget with how much Contempt He was treated, who with wonderful Patience endur'd whatever the Malice of Devils and wicked Men cou'd invent; and 'tis our constant Prayer, that imitating his Greatness of Soul, we also may *bless them who curse us, and pray for them who despitefully use us*. To suffer after Him is no Dishonour, but having His great Example always before our Eyes, we shou'd rather rejoice, as he has encourag'd us to do, when we are persecuted for His sake; for he has assur'd us, and we humbly trust to Him to see it perform'd, that *if we are revil'd for his sake, our Reward shall be great in Heaven.*

The main Ground of Difference between us, in my Opinion, Sir, is the Case of Baptism; but

how ſome Men can improve this to juſtify their traducing us as dangerous Enemys to the State, I'm not clear-ſighted enough to diſcern. 'Tis true, you don't charge us with this; but yet give me leave here to obſerve, that a great many do, and propagate the Opinion all they can: And the Author you ſo much admire, by his inſerting, among other things, the ſcandalous Story of * Mr. *Hicks*, which himſelf can ſcarce forbear confeſſing to be falſe, gives me reaſon to fear he's of the ſame Mind too, tho he endeavours to conceal it. And tho he has pretty well imitated the Moderation and Candor he ſo much pretends to, he fully diſcovers, at ſome Turns, that theſe are only Pretences: witneſs † his aſſerting, that the Forbearance the States of *Holland* allow, and which he miſchievouſly inſinuates is *outdone by another Nation, is the moſt contrary to the Nature and Deſign of Chriſtianity, of any thing that cou'd be devis'd.* Witneſs alſo his ‖ Quotation from Dr. *Featly*, who was certainly the moſt railing Adverſary in the World, and urg'd the Words of the Parable, *Compel 'em to come in*, as ſtrongly as the hotteſt Convertiſt in *France*. And Mr. *Wall* has ſuch an Eſteem for the Doctor's Principles, that in one ſhort Paragraph he cites him three times for *ſetting forth the Miſchiefs of a Toleration in any State*, without adding one Reaſon for it but the Doctor's *ipſe dixit*: and ſays, *the Obſervation the Doctor made upon the firſt Toleration that had ever been in* England, *the Experience of all Times ſince following, has ſhewn to be a juſt one.* Why did not our Author at once ſet himſelf to juſtify more directly the *French* King's acting in relation to our diſtreſſed

* Part II. p. 216. † Part II. p. 388.
‖ Part II. p. 213, 214.

Pro-

Protestant Brethren, who so miserably groan under his most barbarous Oppression? For Dr. *Featly*'s Principles are evidently the same with those of the *French* Convertists.

'Tis therefore more than a Presumption, that our Author's Charity and Moderation are still the very same as when he took so much Care to perform his Part with those who were endeavouring to plunder and root out the *Anabaptists* in his Neighbourhood. But whatever he may think of that matter now, there will come a Time when 'twill be but an unpleasing Reflection to him. And tho he, and others like him, may strive to blacken us, by their false Reports and Innuendo's, we are at present happy in a gracious Queen, who is not to be impos'd on by these Artifices against us: She is sensible we are as hearty as any of her Subjects, and as ready, with the utmost hazard of our Lives and Fortunes, to support the Crown and Dignity she justly enjoys, and so highly adorns. And if I know the Antipædobaptists, as I think I do, I speak from my Conscience, and in God's Presence, I am satisfy'd, there are not truer Friends to the Government, that will do more for it, according to their Abilities, in the three Kingdoms. 'Tis known they acknowledg her Majesty's Tenderness and Care of the common Interest very gratefully, and make her the best Return a Body of private Men can do, by devoutly praying for her Preservation in their publick Assemblys.

But it seems we have the Unhappiness to differ from the Church in several Things, which is Handle enough for some Persons to cry mightily against us. Perhaps they imagine, violent, noisy Pretences to Zeal for the Church, will recommend 'em to Ecclesiastical Preferments, notwithstanding, in reality, the Church is the least of their Concern: and after all, it may sadly be observ'd, that

that Piety and true Religion are almoſt quite loſt, in the midſt of theſe zealous Pretences; for thoſe who make the greateſt Stir about Religion, are too frequently found to have the leaſt regard to it in their Lives and Actions: juſt as the Male-contents and Nonjurors, who can certainly be no Friends to *England*, raiſe the loudeſt Outcrys of the Church's Danger, when, at the ſame time, 'tis known they are the greateſt Enemys to it, and its preſent Eſtabliſhment. How elſe cou'd one of 'em ſo impudently propoſe an Union with the Clergy of *France?* A Friend to that Church can be no Friend to this at home. Yet theſe are the Men who begin the Clamour, to the great Diſturbance of the Catholick Church; and then baſely turn it upon us, by a common Jeſuitical Figure, and cry, that we are the Church's Enemys, and deſign its Ruin; and all for no other Reaſon, Sir, but becauſe we will not intermeddle with it at all. A Feint and Amuſement only, that they may unobſerv'd and unſuſpected betray her more effectually: For if ſhe is in Danger, 'tis from them; from whom, tho we are thought her Enemys, we unfeignedly pray GOD to deliver her. But ſhe need not be apprehenſive of what they can do, while her Majeſty is at her Head, who has piouſly engag'd to protect her, tho not in the Method of *Rome*, and of theſe her Votarys, by cruſhing the innocent, and, it may be, miſtaken Diſſenters. Politicks, perhaps, might perſuade her to treat her avow'd Enemys with more Severity, who dare queſtion her Title, and her Supremacy in all Eccleſiaſtical as well as Civil Matters, throughout her Realms; which many of the Clergy, contrary to their repeated moſt ſolemn Oaths, publickly do: but ſhe will never be brought to believe that GOD is, like the barbarous Heathen Dæmons, to be delighted with the dreadful Pomp of Human Sacrifices,

crifices, and huge Draughts of the reeking Blood of poor trembling Wretches.

'Tis ſtrange any Men ſhou'd go to introduce Dragoons and Faggots into a Syſtem of Chriſtian Religion; for what can be more directly contrary to our SAVIOUR's Doctrine and Example, than Malice, and Oppreſſion, and Maſſacres? or more prepoſterous, than to ſend them to Hell (for they damn all Hereticks thither) to ſave their Souls? While, on the other hand, Charity and mutual Forbearance, and to treat one another like Brethren, are the bleſſed Fruits and Conſequences of his moſt holy Doctrines; and whatever may be inſinuated, theſe are the Things our Principles teach us. We deſire to be His Diſciples, and therefore following His holy Inſtructions, we reſolve * *to love one another*; and if any creep in among us of a contrary Temper, we heartily renounce both them and their Practices. But enough of this.

Perſons of more Honour, and better Underſtanding and Temper, purſue more commendable Methods; and as CHRIST has committed to 'em *the Sword of the* SPIRIT, *which is the Word of* GOD, they employ that alone to defend His Church and Truth. And undoubtedly, the moſt effectual way to ſuppreſs Error is, (and it is the only one CHRIST has provided) by Arguments drawn from the Scriptures; which are, in their own nature, moſt proper to convince the Judgment, and work upon the Affections too. This is the Buſineſs and indiſpenſible Duty of every careful Shepherd of CHRIST's Flock, over the Conſciences of whom he has no Power, but to teach, *and knowing the Terror of the* LORD, *to perſuade Men.*

---

* John 13. *ver.* 35.

But,

But, you ſay, *This has been always our Pretence, and we have conſtantly commended this Method, becauſe it is ſo gentle, and we can eaſily put by the Force of it: For we ſeem reſolv'd to take very little Notice of what is done in this kind; or at leaſt, obſtinately to cavil at it, tho ever ſo unreaſonably.* But indeed, Sir, you wrong us very much; for if we are in an Error, we heartily deſire to be convinc'd of it: and every one muſt acknowledg, we are not ty'd to our Opinion by Reputation and Intereſt; ſince it rather deprives us of thoſe Honours and valuable Promotions in the State and Church we might otherwiſe enjoy a ſhare of. Tho for my own part, thoſe Advantages don't in the leaſt tempt my utmoſt Ambition, to make me, in diſobedience to God and my Conſcience, deny what I know and believe to be right; yet out of mere reſpect to Truth, I ſhall ever think my ſelf oblig'd to any Man who kindly takes pains to undeceive me in a Matter he thinks I am miſtaken in, and ſhall always be open to Inſtruction: And as far as I can judg of our whole Body, they are ready to embrace the Truth, and renounce their Errors, as ſoon as they ſhall be made appear to be ſuch by authentick Proofs. And this Character Mr. *Wall* himſelf too allows us, among other things to the ſame effect, adding theſe Words, ‖ *I take 'em generally to be cordial, open, and frank Expreſſers of their Sentiments.*

You call this, alſo, the *Old Cant*, and *hope we will no more make uſe of it, till we have anſwer'd what is ſo learnedly written againſt us by Mr.* Wall; *who has*, you think, *moſt effectually ruin'd our Cauſe, in the Judgment of all reaſonable conſiderate Men.* But that you are miſtaken in your Opinion of his Book,

‖ Part II. p. 416.

and

and that Mr. *Wall* has done our Cause no Prejudice, nor is the formidable Adversary you represent him to be, is as clear to me, as the contrary seems to you, and perhaps you may be persuaded shortly to think so too. I confess, I look on what he has done, as the best Defence of Infant-Baptism extant, and therefore it deserves an Answer. And you may expect a complete one, by a very learned Hand, which, 'tis likely, may go far toward putting an end to the Controversy; but the Person who undertakes it, is under such Avocations, that I doubt it will be some time before it can be publish'd. In the mean while, therefore, I will set my self to obey your Commands, (for such I esteem the Requests of my Friends) and the more willingly, that I may confirm you in the good Opinion you are pleas'd to express of me: You think I have so much Ingenuity, as to follow Truth wherever I find it; and since I persist in my former Notion, you are willing to believe I have something which appears a Reason to me, to offer in my Defence: and on this account, you shall be glad, you say, to know my Sentiments of Mr. *Wall*'s Book; which I will give you, without Prejudice or Heat, and I hope the Consequence will be the continuance of your Friendship.

I esteem Mr. *Wall*'s, I said, the best Defence of Infant-Baptism I have seen, and that for those Reasons on which he recommends it himself in his Preface. I believe, indeed, they are not all sound; but he all the way endeavours to impose 'em on the Reader with such an Air, as shall make 'em pass for such with many. Besides, it must be allow'd he has, in some respects, argu'd to more advantage than any before him, having reap'd the Benefit of their Writings; but with all his Advantages, and tho he stands on the Shoulders of those who have gone before him, his

Size

Size is not ſo gigantick, that we need be afraid to engage him, and enter the Diſpute. But before I come to Particulars, it may be proper to make ſome general Remarks, which will be of ſervice to us, when we conſider the ſeveral Arguments wherein his Strength lies.

In the firſt place, Sir, I muſt deſire you to believe Mr. *Wall* is not every where to be depended on: He repreſents ſome Things ſo unfairly, and others in ſo falſe a Light, that he is not to be read without much Caution and Diſtruſt. He won'd be thought, indeed, a mighty fair and impartial Writer, and to this end, endeavours to conceal the contrary Byaſs he was under; and he has done it ſo ſucceſsfully too, that he has had the good Fortune generally to gain the Reputation he aim'd at; but how undeſervedly, I will leave you, tho ſo much his Friend, to judg, by the following Inſtances.

He tells us in the Title-Page, his Deſign is *impartially to collect all the Paſſages in the Writers of the four firſt Centurys, as do make either For or Againſt Infant-Baptiſm.* And afterwards * he ſays, *he has produc'd all he has met with in the Authors that wrote in the four firſt Centurys*; and that he has done it in † *their own Words, without omitting any one that he knows of* within the limited Time. He aſſures us of it again in another place ‖, in order to remove all Doubts, and perſuade you, that he has not ſuffer'd a ſingle Inſtance to eſcape his Diligence, eſpecially in the earlieſt Ages. But I am poſitive, I cou'd eaſily point out ſeveral Paſſages, all cited from Writers in the three firſt Centurys, which he has taken no notice of, and

---

* Part II. p. 1. † Introd. p. 2. ‖ Part II. p. 8.

each

each of 'em stronger in favour of Antipædobaptism, than any he produces for the contrary, till St. *Cyprian*'s Time. This is not the proper Place, but if there is occasion, I intend to give you some hereafter, when they may more conveniently fall in: At present, I shall only observe, he discovers his Design, notwithstanding his Pretences to Impartiality, was to establish the Baptism of Infants, I had almost said *per fas & nefas*. For after a long Quotation from *Justin Martyr*'s first Apology, which does not in the least touch on the Baptism of Infants, as Mr. *Wall* himself confesses, he makes the Reader put the Question *, *To what Purpose this* is cited *in a Discourse of Infant-Baptism?* plainly intimating, it did not directly serve his secret real Design, the Baptism of Infants not being spoken of in it; however, to ballance the matter, he says, it makes nothing against it neither, in which he is manifestly in the wrong.

The *Martyr* is there giving the Emperor an account of the Christian Form of Baptizing in general, as 'twas administer'd to all, and not, as Mr. *Wall* takes the freedom, without any ground, to suppose, to those only who were converted from Heathenism; thereby introducing Two Baptisms into the Church, contrary to the express Words of St. *Paul* ‖, and making *Justin* most imprudently fall into what he was endeavouring to avoid, namely, the Suspicion of *dealing unfairly*, by concealing some thing from the Emperor's Knowledg. But to fortify his Conjecture, he adds, the Reason of the Martyr's profound Silence in the matter was, that *he had no Occasion to speak of the Case of Infants*.

---

* Part I. p. 15. ‖ Eph. iv. 5.

A very disingenuous Assertion! as you can't but think it, Sir, if you call to mind the Scandal Christians were commonly under, in those Days, which St. *Justin* himself, and all the Apologists are so careful to remove, I mean, their being tax'd with murdering their Children at their Meetings, and feasting on their Flesh. For this Calumny was industriously spread among the Pagans, and the Christians clear'd themselves very well; but without disparaging the Arguments they employ'd, I'll venture to say, the Baptism of Infants, if it had been in use among 'em, might have been urg'd with as much Weight as any, and they wou'd certainly have thought it as conclusive, and not have pass'd it over with a total Neglect.

On the whole, I infer, and I hope not without Reason, this Passage of St. *Justin* is directly against Infant-Baptism; and therefore, when Mr. *Wall* says, 'tis not *directly* for his Purpose, that must imply, whatever he pretends, his Aim was only to find out what might be most plausibly offer'd for the Opinion he had before entertain'd. I draw this Inference not from this Passage alone, but from several others also in his Book, and from what I'm going to add in the next place, which perhaps you may esteem the plainer Proof.

After our Author has labour'd ‖ to establish the Credit of St. *Cyprian*, and his Testimonys for Infant-Baptism, supposing the Reader sufficiently prepar'd to understand all that Father says of Baptism, as including Pædobaptism too; he presents us with a Citation out of his Common-Place Book, as Mr. *Wall* terms it, where St. *Cyprian*, to shew the Necessity of Regeneration *and*

‖ Part I. p. 57, 58.

Baptism, (not *or* Baptism, which wou'd have answer'd Mr. *Wall*'s End better) uses the Words of St. *John*, * *Except a Man be born*, &c. and then suddenly changing the Person, because St. *Cyprian* quoted St. *John*, he substitutes St. *John*'s Authority in the room of St. *Cyprian*'s, and runs on as if he was only arguing from that sacred Testimony, to fix the Sense of those Words in some Particulars he had most occasion for, and which have really no Difficulty in 'em.

Thus having pass'd it on you, that St. *Cyprian* does sometimes speak in favour of Infant-Baptism, and then taking it for granted he does it here too; he shifts Authoritys, after his singular Method of improving Things, and makes a Descant on the Words of St. *John*, in hopes to carry it with the credulous Reader; and at last concludes, that from these Considerations, we may *see plainly* this is a good Testimony for Infant-Baptism.

And as he represents it, indeed, it seems to have some Weight. But pray, Sir, observe the Fallacy: To persuade you that St. *Cyprian* means nothing but Water-Baptism, he unfairly cuts off these Words taken out of the same Gospel, † *Except ye eat the Flesh, and drink the Blood of the Son of Man, ye have no Life in you*; which immediately follow those cited by Mr. *Wall*, and make up this whole Chapter. As if he foresaw they wou'd lessen the Testimony he was so fond of, and therefore, in point of Prudence, might be omitted: For 'tis clear from them, that by *Regenerate* in the Text, St. *Cyprian* did not understand Baptism only, nor at all indeed, for that Word seems plainly to refer to these Words, *John* vi. 53. and also, that

* John iii. 5.
† Ib. vi. 53.

he pleads as ſtrongly for the Neceſſity of communicating Infants, as baptizing 'em.

Mr. *Wall* therefore, being preſs'd afterwards * by Mr. *Daillé*'s Argument from this Paſſage, to prove Infants were admitted, in St. *Cyprian*'s time, to the Euchariſt, wou'd extricate himſelf, by owning, in expreſs Terms, when he thinks it has firſt had its effect in this place, that *it wou'd be but a very weak* Argument for Infant-Baptiſm, *were it not that he himſelf (viz. St.* Cyprian) *in other places mentions Infants by Name, as contain'd under the general Rule that requires Baptiſm*; and with this confeſſion of his Diſingenuity, he thinks to ward off the Force of Mr. *Daillé*'s Argument. But this does him no manner of Kindneſs; for whatever may appear from other Paſſages to have been St. *Cyprian*'s Judgment in the Caſe, if this particular Paſſage does not prove it, (as he confeſſes it does not) a Man of his pretended Impartiality ſhou'd not have inſiſted on it. Beſides, whatever he wou'd have us believe, he muſt needs perceive, thoſe Texts being join'd together without any thing between 'em but a neceſſary *Copula*, under the ſame Head, and unavoidably apply'd to the ſame Subject, the Paſſage is either of no uſe to confirm Infant-Baptiſm, or elſe it may be as well urg'd for their being admitted to the awful Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. To ſave you the trouble of turning to the place, I will tranſcribe the whole Chapter, which Mr. *Wall* did not think fit to do, that you may ſee whoſe Reaſons are beſt grounded. The general Head of this Chapter in St. *Cyprian* is, † *Except any one be bap-*

* Part II. p. 355.

† *Lib.* 3. *Teſtimonior. ad Quirin.* c. 25.
Ad regnum Dei niſi baptizatus & renatus quis fuerit, pervenire non poſſe.

baptized and born again, he cannot come to the Kingdom of God: And the Chapter it self runs thus.

In the Gospel according to St. John: *Except any one is born again of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. For that which is born of the Flesh is Flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit.* And again: *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you.*

This is the entire Chapter, without any Alteration, just as 'tis publish'd by the learned Bishop *Fell.*

He has acted with the same Artifice in relation to the *Apostolical Constitutions*, as they are call'd. For he produces Words from the sixth Book, direct indeed to his Purpose; only they, like all the other boasted clear Proofs, unluckily happen to be spurious, and foisted in, as many other things were, during the fourth Century, as he himself is forc'd to confess. And how he can make 'em of any Authority then, I leave his own Conscience to answer. He gives but an indifferent Account of their Collection into one Body at first, nor dares deny their being frequently alter'd afterwards, and interpolated till about the 4th Century. Monsieur *Jurieu* also questions their Antiquity, and says, * *They are a Work of the fourth Age, and perhaps the fifth.* It's certain, they have been considerably alter'd since *Epiphanius*'s Time, who died

---

Evangelio cata Joannem: Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua & spiritu, non potest introire in regnum Dei. Quod enim natum est de carne, caro est: & quod natum est de spiritu spiritus est. Item dic: Nisi ederitis carnem filii hominis, & biberitis sanguinem eius, non habebitis vitam in vobis.

* Lett. Pastorale 9. an. 1686. Cette Compilation qu'on appelle les Constitutions Apostoliques, est un ouvrage du quatriéme siecle, qui peut être du cinquiéme.

in the fifth Century; for of the many Paſſages he quotes from 'em, ſome are very different, others are contrary, and ſome not to be found, as they are read now.

Theſe Circumſtances, if Mr. *Wall* had been unprejudic'd, wou'd have ſunk the Authority of the *Conſtitutions* very low with him. And to ſhew I am not miſtaken, in another place * he uſes 'em meanly himſelf. He cou'd not avoid owning they mention'd communicating of Infants, which made it not for his purpoſe they ſhou'd be well thought of; and therefore he tacks about, and undervalues 'em to ſuch a degree, that he thinks 'em not worth an Anſwer. So plain is it, by his own Words and Management, that he endeavours to perſuade his Readers, by ſtraining a Paſſage, which, according to his own Confeſſion, is not to his purpoſe. And what can we expect, Sir, from ſuch a Writer? I wiſh, for his own ſake, he had conſider'd a little ſooner of what he afterwards ſays, † *That any Antipædobaptiſt*, I add, or Pædobaptiſt either, *who having better Means of Knowledg, is convinc'd that any of theſe Arguments have really no force, and yet does urge 'em on the more ignorant People, acts very diſingenuouſly towards 'em, and is a Prevaricator in the things of God. For to uſe any Argument with an Intent to deceive, has in it (tho there be no Propoſition utter'd that is falſe* in Terminis) *the nature of a Lye: which as it is baſe and unmanly in human Affairs, ſo it is impious when 'tis pretended to be for God; as* Job *ſays*, ch. xiii. 7.

How little Mr. *Wall* is to be rely'd on, appears farther, if you obſerve how induſtriouſly he takes all Advantages to blacken us, and render us the Objects of Reſentment and Contempt, by many

* Part II. p. 360. † Part II. p. 382.

things which are carefully ſcatter'd thro his whole Book: That a Man who ſets himſelf to write with this Temper and Deſign, will ſay any thing that favours his Intention, a common Knowledg of the World will acquaint us by infinite Examples. When an Author once makes it his Buſineſs to expoſe and defame his Adverſary, he never fails to mention every thing that may diſcredit him: Old Storys, tho ever ſo falſe and ſcandalous, are repeated anew; all former Wounds tore open afreſh, and rak'd into to the very Bone; and thoſe Animoſitys, which had been happily extinguiſh'd and effac'd by a more charitable Temper, or elſe conſiderably worn out by Time, are again reviv'd, and perhaps with new Improvements of Malice. He gives his own Cauſe the moſt pleaſing Colours, and inſinuates himſelf into your Belief with ſpecious Pretences of Argument, and an Air of Probability and Aſſurance: For, as *Tully* obſerves, * *There is nothing ſo abſurd and incredible, but may be repreſented ſo as to look very probable.*

But this is not all; there is another Invention, and that is, to aſſume an Appearance of Impartiality and Equanimity, and talk much of it; and under this Diſguiſe, to inſert ſuch Innuendo's and Expreſſions as will provoke the Paſſion of haſty Bigots againſt his Antagoniſts. Thus to make 'em look like Criminals and dangerous Perſons, 'tis pretended, they are liable to the Laſh of the Law, but are ſpar'd out of Generoſity and Tenderneſs; that their Principles and main Deſign are to overturn both Church and State; that they have ſome pernicious Intereſt to carry on, ſome Ambition or ſome Paſſion to gratify; and are a

* Paradox. cap. 1. Nihil eſt tam incredibile, quod non dicendo fiat probabile.

ſort of obſtinate *Bouteſeus* and Hereticks: and to ſecure all, a great many ſcandalous Falſhoods are officiouſly obtruded on the Credulous, as diligently as if they were the Fundamental Articles of the Chriſtian Faith. And if I can form any Judgment, Mr. *Wall* has too near approach'd this Method.

You'll be ſurpriz'd, I know, Sir, at ſo ſevere a Charge from me, who have always ſo much talk'd of and admir'd Charity, as the moſt amiable, darling Attribute of the ALMIGHTY; * *For* GOD *is Love:* witneſs the amazing Inſtance of it in His Redeeming us from the Curſe, by the Sacrifice of His Only begotten SON. But you muſt not upbraid me with violating even the ſtricteſt Rules of Charity, which the Doctrine and Example of the BLESSED JESUS have taught us, and which I pray GOD I may always diligently ſtudy to obſerve. I'm very backward, and you muſt be ſenſible of it, to uſe ſo much as an ordinary Liberty of cenſuring the Actions of others: Nothing grates more upon my natural Temper, than to tell unwelcom Truths, and lay Mens Faults before 'em. I much rather chuſe, which perhaps is the contrary Extreme, to paſs 'em by, for the moſt part, in Silence: And I wou'd willingly have done ſo here, if I had not believ'd it wou'd be a manifeſt Prejudice to the Truth; for I ſaw what Succeſs his Arts had with you, and therefore I thought it altogether ſeaſonable, to diſtinguiſh thoſe Things in our Author which juſtly render all he ſays ſuſpected: and when you find what full Proof I can make of all I tax him with, I hope you'll be ſatisfy'd, I have done nothing inconſiſtent with the noble Principles of Charity I profeſs and ſo much magnify;

* 1 John iv. 8.

but

but, on the contrary, was even oblig'd by them to do you and our Cause this piece of Justice. In the mean while, if any thing really blame-worthy or indecent has slip'd from me, I heartily beg pardon of you and Mr. *Wall*, and shall be very sorry whenever I perceive it.

'Tis generally allow'd, and justly, that Men of the greatest Learning and Penetration, who are duly furnish'd with proper Materials, and have taken considerable Pains to search out the Truth, are best qualify'd to judg in any Case, and are most to be depended on. We are naturally pretty much inclin'd to submit our selves, in a good degree, to their Resolutions. Mr. *Wall* was appris'd of this, and that the far greater part of your Church acknowledg (as abundance have done in my hearing) they practise Infant-Baptism more on the Authority of the learned, venerable Body of their Clergy, than for any Reason they see either in the Scriptures or in the Nature of the Thing. It very much concern'd him, therefore, to preserve this Esteem in the Minds of the People, lest if it wore off, they shou'd start from their Liturgy, look about 'em, and bravely assume the Liberty of judging for themselves, and refuse to be led any longer in Shackles.

I am apt to think, this put Mr. *Wall* to the fruitless Pains of introducing so many Things, which are really nothing to the Purpose, but only as they serve his Ostentation, and to display his Reading. Thus, for Instance, of what Use in a Discourse of Infant-Baptism, is a History of the false * *Decretal Epistles* of the Bishops of *Rome?* when at the same time he allows, and we don't ask him to prove it, they are spurious, and forg'd

* Part I. p. 175.

by an ignorant Romaniſt, *viz.* all of 'em before *Siricius*'s, who came to the Chair about 385. As ſuperfluous to the full is his tedious and partial Hiſtory of *Pelagius*, and the Hereſy which takes its Name from him, which reaches quite thro that long 19th Chapter, and fills near a hundred Pages of his firſt Part, which contains but 360 in all, including the Title, Preface, and Introduction.

He offers, 'tis true, to excuſe the Digreſſion *, but I think very indifferently: for whatever he may think of the matter, it neither illuſtrates nor enforces his Arguments in the leaſt; which wou'd have been as clear and valid, tho he had ſav'd himſelf and his Reader all that trouble: but then he wou'd not ſo well have gratify'd his Ambition to be thought a Man of more than ordinary Learning and Application. I wonder he did not with the ſame Excuſe, draw in more ſuch Hiſtorys at every Turn, which offer'd as fair, and might have done him as much Service as theſe: for I can't ſee, how *the Senſe of* the other *Places* can be *apprehended* better than thoſe of St. *Auguſtin*, &c. unleſs he had taken the ſame Pains as largely to *ſhew on what Occaſions they were ſpoken* likewiſe.

But even in this Digreſſion, which was long enough in Reaſon without it, it falls ſo luckily in his way, he muſt needs treat of the lawfulneſs of an Oath, and poſſeſſing great Riches without giving all to the Poor; both which, 'tis ſaid, the *Pelagians* held were damnable. This is perfect Excurſion, when a bare Narration had ſuffic'd, eſpecially conſidering he was out upon the Ramble already; and that neither theſe things, nor what gave him occaſion to mention 'em, have any relation to his Subject.

* Pref. p. 9.

A little after, he lanches out again; and will by no means allow the Blessed Virgin to have been without Sin, since he found the *Pelagians* made the Belief of it a necessary Article. But I must once more remark to you, all this is nothing but Trifling; for whether she was the immaculate, adorable Virgin, the Papists idolatrously maintain, or only the holy Mother of our LORD according to the Scriptures, how is the present Controversy affected by it? Infants may or may not have as much Right as Adult Persons to Christian Baptism, which-ever of these Opinions is true.

But I'm weary with following our Author thro things of this nature, and therefore will only add, out of a multitude, one more of his Sallys, because it is very long and very impertinent. 'Tis in the Second Part, and employs no less than twenty Pages, *viz.* from a hundred to the end of the Chapter. He takes occasion there severely to scourge the *Socinians*, and all that he fancys favour 'em any way; and, as always when he touches this Point, which is pretty frequently, he discovers abundance of Heat, and I think is constantly transported even beyond the Bounds of Civility and Good Manners.

Whether the Fathers held a Numerical or only a Specifical Union in the *Divine Nature*, has been warmly disputed by several considerable Men; and is a Branch of one of the most celebrated and intricate Controversys in Divinity: this might tempt Mr. *Wall*, perhaps, to think it a fair Opportunity for him to shew his Abilitys in determining a Matter of this nature. But it had been more to his Honour, if he had us'd a little Moderation, and not been altogether so Dogmatical, which has too much of the

Preceptor

Preceptor to pleaſe any but the Ignorant, who are mightily taken with Noiſe and Confidence, which is always to ſuch the beſt Reaſon and the beſt Eloquence.

But yet I can't ſee any great Execution Mr. *Wall* has done: for tho I'm as far from Socinianiſm, or Tritheiſm either, which he believes is charg'd on the Fathers by Mr. *Le Clerc*, &c. and which I'm perſuaded they are perfectly clear of; tho I'm as far, I ſay, from theſe two Extremes as any Man living, yet I can't help thinking, there are ſome Difficultys too great for Mr. *Wall* to maſter, if we may be allow'd to judg from the Specimen he has giv'n us of his Skill. And it muſt be confeſs'd, either thro * Incaution, or whatever elſe may be fancy'd the Reaſon, there are Paſſages in the Antients which require a curious Headpiece to excuſe.

After all, he cou'd not expect to win much Reputation by tranſient Reflections on ſo copious a Subject; for at beſt, thoſe ſhort Sketches can ſignify but very little: and therefore, ſince the matter is ſo very extenſive, and very intricate too, I wiſh he had not meddl'd with it here; for one can't forbear enquiring, to what purpoſe? and how it is brought into a Diſcourſe of this nature? I don't ſee any other Reaſon that cou'd prompt him to it, than only an indiſcreet Ambition to magnify himſelf, and his Learning. 'Tis this, perhaps, makes him run ſo much upon the Socinians in ſeveral places, who, by his Leave, are not ſo deſpicable a ſort of Men as he wou'd have us think; witneſs, beſides other things, *Crellius*'s famous Treatiſe, *De Uno Deo Patre:* which, after all his O-

* Part II. p. 115, 116.

vations

vations and Triumphs, yet wants a ſubſtantial Anſwer; and I'm glad to find ſo learn'd a Man as Dr. *Whitby* of the ſame Mind. Not but that I'm perſuaded, all that is there ſo ingeniouſly and advantageouſly urg'd, might be effectually confuted to general Satisfaction, if the Doctor, or ſome other learned Hand, who is furniſh'd, like him, with all neceſſary Qualifications, wou'd in good earneſt ſet about it.

I mention theſe things, Sir, to convince you, Mr. *Wall*'s Digreſſions are neither neceſſarily brought in, nor skilfully handl'd; which renders him the more inexcuſable: for who can be prevail'd on to think well of the Conduct of that Man, who, without any kind of Neceſſity, takes ſuch a world of Pains to expoſe himſelf? And I believe, by this time, you are ready to grant it; and that I have aſſign'd the moſt probable Reaſon of it. How ridiculous and mean muſt it then appear, for him, of all Men, to reflect ſo unjuſtly on Mr. *Stennett*, as if he had needleſly tranſlated ſo many Pages of *French*, only to ſhew his * *Vein of fine Language*, of which he is a Maſter; when 'tis certain the whole Paſſage was directly and very much to his purpoſe? while this Man's own Digreſſions are longer, and utterly foreign to the matter in hand. But he knew what kind of Influence theſe Methods wou'd have on the People of his Party, and has, without doubt, found his Account in fitting his Calculations to that Meridian: which brings to mind an Obſervation of his own, *That there is a ſort of People, that take a malicious Pleaſure in trying how broad Affronts the Underſtandings of ſome Men will bear.*

---

* Part II. p. 287.

Another

Another thing our Author ſo induſtriouſly improves to the ſame purpoſe, muſt not be omitted: 'Tis an ill-natur'd *Pleaſure* indeed he takes in arraigning and cenſuring very ſeverely ſome of the greateſt Men for Wit and Learning that have appear'd. No body can read him without obſerving, how liberal he is of his quarrelſom Criticiſms, and how free he makes with their Characters, without any Deference to their Station: doubtleſs, deſigning to place himſelf above them, and to be underſtood to be a Perſon of much better Apprehenſion; or, at leaſt, to have div'd deeper into the Knowledg of Things.

I'm unwilling to bear too hard upon Mr. *Wall*, and therefore won't ſay he deſign'd a Reflection on that worthy Man Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*, when he gives him an inferior Title, barely ſtyling him * *Biſhop*; whereas he never was a mere *Biſhop* in his Life: it looks therefore as if he queſtion'd his Grace's Title to that high Dignity he was ſo deſervedly rais'd to; or elſe diſallow'd of the Order of an Archbiſhop, tho otherwiſe, indeed, I ſee no reaſon to think him an Enemy to the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy. But my Lord of *Sarum* is more apparently vilify'd. Mr. *Wall* does not name him indeed, but every one knows who is *the Author of the late Expoſition of the* XXXIX *Articles of the Church of* England. And for the indecent Treatment he has given to a Man of his Lordſhip's Character and high Station in the Church, I refer you to the place cited below †.

Every Man is at liberty to think as he can, and to defend his Opinions upon occaſion, and

---

* Part II. p. 384. † Part II. p. 124.

if

if it be neceſſary, handſomly to ſhew the Miſtakes he thinks any great Man has been guilty of; but this ſhou'd be done with all Decorum to his Parts and Character, which is very much wanting in Mr. *Wall*, eſpecially in the ſecond Chapter of his ſecond Part, where he profeſſedly calls to account ſeveral learned Moderns, who have, or ſeem to have written in favour of Antipædobaptiſm, as *Ludovicus Vives*, *Curcellæus*, *Rigaltius*, Biſhop *Taylor*, Biſhop *Barlow*, *Bilius*, *Daillé*, &c. As to *Rigaltius*, he makes Dr. *Fell*, the *Zealous Biſhop of Oxford*, his Precedent; but his Lordſhip's being a little warm on this occaſion, who at other times ſhews *Rigaltius* the *Reſpect which his great Learning deſerv'd*, will in no wiſe juſtify Mr. *Wall*'s being continually out of Temper, as perhaps he expected it ſhou'd; for this may eaſily be pardon'd in a Man of his Lordſhip's Elevation towards one of an inferior Rank.

When he wants their Authority, our Author is full of Veneration to the Writers of Antiquity; and is mightily enrag'd at any one that ventures to ſay the leaſt thing to their Diſcredit: for 'tis no leſs than Blaſphemy with him, and touches Chriſtianity ſo home, that if purſu'd it wou'd drive it out of the World. But afterwards, when they ſtand too much in his way, he is as rough with 'em as any, and gives 'em no more Quarter than the reſt of their Enemys do. Thus *Gregory Nazianzen*, Father and Son, are but indifferently handl'd. The * Father is repreſented an *ignorant* Man, and of very *mean Capacitys*; and the † Son is a Trimmer, who merely in complaiſance to his *ignorant* Father,

* Part II. p. 372.
† Part I. p. 82. *and* Part II. p. 61.

perſuades

perſuades Men, againſt his Conſcience, to neglect what he knows is their Duty, and take the Liberty to defer the Baptiſm of their Children to a more convenient Time than he believ'd CHRIST and His Church at firſt ſaw fit to appoint. An odd Character of Biſhops of the Chriſtian Church, whoſe Order enhances, and not (as Mr. *Wall* vainly imagines) in the leaſt extenuates the Crime; for the Prieſthood, if any, and eſpecially the Biſhops, ought ſtrictly to maintain the Purity of our LORD's Inſtitutions, and be, as the Apoſtle ſays *, in all Reſpects, *blameleſs*. But Mr. *Wall* had rather they ſhou'd appear ſuch as he has deſcrib'd 'em, than make any Figure againſt him: for ſo he finds their Practice and Teſtimony to be, and has no other way to come off, but this, and pretending they were † *ſingular* in this Practice; and yet unwarily, a few Lines after, he confeſſes, 'twas very common at that time for Perſons to defer their Childrens Baptiſm till they were in danger of Death.

He is yet bolder with St. *Chryſoſtom*, and I think with leſs Cauſe. That Father's way of arguing againſt Circumciſion, indeed, will hold as well againſt Pædobaptiſm: but his Deſign does not ſeem to have been any thing that way; and it being not material to our purpoſe, I ſhall not examin it. For however this be, I'm ſure it ſavours too much of ſomewhat I don't care to name, to repreſent ſo great a Man, and a Biſhop of the Illuſtrious See of *Conſtantinople*, as a ‖ *Leaden-headed Logician*, whom all the Antients juſtly admir'd

* 1 Tim. iii. 2. † Part II. p. 59. *and* 61.
‖ Part I. p. 111.

for

for his maſterly Eloquence, and exemplary Piety.

But of all he concerns himſelf with, he ſingles out the learned *Grotius*, and Mr. *Le Clerc*, in chief: he carefully catches at all Opportunitys to bring theſe upon the Stage. His Memory never fails him for the latter, whom he hales in ſo unaccountably, as if one great Reaſon of his writing this Hiſtory was, that he might find Opportunitys to quarrel with a Man of his Figure in the World. Mr. *Le Clerc*, I believe, will never think it worth his while to take notice of our Author's Reflections; for he has ſome time ſince publiſh'd, in the third Part of the *Ars Critica*, the Reaſons, in a Letter to Mr. *Limborch*, why he neglects the Calumnys of much more conſiderable Men; and it wou'd be well our Author wou'd do himſelf the kindneſs to read 'em. It concerns us to be acquainted with Mr. *Wall*'s Sincerity, and therefore let us a little examin the Caſe.

You may obſerve he is angry with Mr. *Le Clerc* chiefly on theſe Two Accounts: Becauſe he endeavours with ſo * *foul a Mouth* to vilify the Fathers and their Writings; and the other is, his ſuſpected Heterodoxy concerning the Bleſſed TRINITY, and particularly the DEITY of CHRIST. This is the common Objection of all Mr. *Le Clerc*'s Enemys, for which they moſt bitterly exclaim againſt him, tho very unjuſtly, and oftentimes in very bad Language too. But it ought to be conſider'd, whether a different Sentiment, or ſuſpending the Judgment in ſo abſtruſe a Point, is a ſufficient warrant to diſpenſe with the Rules of Charity and Forbear-

* Part II. p. 114, 117, *&c.* and 343.

ance;

ance, which the Great Incarnate God ſo repeatedly enjoins, and has made the diſcriminating Badg of His Diſciples. 'Tis dreadfully ſevere to damn Men, becauſe they can't *find out the* ALMIGHTY *to perfection*; for *who then can be ſav'd?* But, Thanks be to GOD, the Scriptures give us better Hopes, and at the ſame time aſſure us, their Condition is much the more dangerous, who ſo freely preſume to judg their Brethren: *For thou art inexcuſable, O Man,* (ſays St. *Paul,* Rom. ii. 1.) *whoſoever thou art, that judgeſt.*

Beſides, ſuch Men, in effect, do nothing leſs than oppoſe themſelves to the merciful Deſigns of our Great REDEEMER, and ſtrive to fruſtrate his kind Endeavour to make us like Himſelf, while He wou'd teach us thoſe admirable Vertues of Meekneſs, Love, and Good-will, *&c.* And tho He has been pleas'd to take ſo much more Care to fix us right in the Practice of theſe things, than in the Speculations which diſturb us; yet an exact Conformity in theſe weighty Matters, which our LORD Himſelf lays ſo much Streſs on, a ſpotleſs Converſation, a pious Life in all Godlineſs and Honeſty, are not Protection powerful enough to ſecure Men from the Inſults of theſe Furioſos, as if they thought all moral Vertues were nothing, without being right in the Notion of the *Trinity*; and that this one Speculation might compenſate for the want of all other good Qualitys: and I believe, Sir, you may have obſerv'd, with me, that many of theſe fiery Zealots are none of the exacteſt Men in their Lives. But GOD grant they may in time conſider that moſt charitable Warning our Gracious LORD has given 'em of their Danger, beforehand aſſuring 'em, *Not every one that ſays unto Him,* LORD! LORD! and in Words only acknowledg his mighty Power and Attributes,

ſhall

ſhall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he only *that does the Will of* His FATHER *which is in Heaven.*

But what conſiderably aggravates the Crime in the preſent Caſe, is, that the Charge is utterly falſe; and 'tis ſtrange Perſons that pretend to Juſtice and Honour, ſhou'd exclaim againſt Mr. *Le Clerc* on ſuch ſlender grounds, who muſt be acknowledg'd a Man of great Piety and Learning. For the Subſtance of all they urge, with any manner of Probability, is, That his Interpretations of ſeveral Portions of Scripture deſtroy the fine Gloſſes others have built upon 'em; and that he has gone about to ſhew that the Fathers did not altogether underſtand this Myſtery in the preſent Orthodox Senſe. Hence ſome angry Men proceed to accuſe him of *Socinianiſm*, ſome (for they are not agreed) of *Arianiſm*, and others again of *Photinianiſm*; but they all join to reproach him, tho for no Reaſon, as I can diſcover, but his refuſing to ſtrain any Text which he believes in his Conſcience is not to the purpoſe, as Men of no mean Figure have done. A Method which, he rightly thinks, only ſerves to expoſe the Cauſe they pretend to vindicate.

By the way, Sir, I wou'd not be thought to juſtify all his Expoſitions; ſome of 'em I receive, and thank him for; but not all: and I know Mr. *Le Clerc* will not be offended at my diſſenting. The Queſtion is not whether his Interpretations are juſt, or not; he thinks they are, and has a Right therefore to propoſe 'em, without being ſtun'd with ſuch hideous Outcrys of *Socinianiſm*, *&c.* eſpecially ſince in ſeveral Parts of his Works he has clear'd himſelf to the Satisfaction of any impartial Readers. I open'd the third Volume of his *Ars Critica*, and the following places in his

Letter to his Grace the preſent Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* turn'd up.

The Letter was occaſion'd by ſome too ſevere Reflections that had been caſt on him by the learned Dr. *Cave*, and which the Doctor himſelf knows are not very agreeable with the pure charitable Spirit which ennobled *Primitive Chriſtianity*. 'Tis not our Buſineſs to enter into the Merits of their Controverſy; any one who will take the Pleaſure to read the Volume of Letters I refer to, may perceive how much Mr. *Le Clerc* has been abus'd, and withal, how able he is to defend himſelf. What is more immediately to our Purpoſe, is, that the Doctor had ſuggeſted, Mr. *Le Clerc* was either *Arian* or *Photinian*, he did not certainly know which: but conſidering the wide Difference between theſe two Opinions, and that the *Arians* anathemiz'd the *Photinians*, and were the moſt active in that Council which depos'd, and procur'd the Baniſhment of *Photinus* Biſhop of *Sirmium*, in the Year 351; it's ſtrange, as Mr. *Le Clerc* obſerves, that any Man ſhou'd ſo expreſs himſelf, as to make it plain he was a Favourer of one of theſe Partys, and yet leave it ſo hard to determine, that the Doctor himſelf ſhou'd not be able to gueſs which. For his Satisfaction, Mr. *Le Clerc* aſſures him he is neither. But take in ſhort what is ſufficient to wipe off the Slander, in his own Words.

* *Whether* Euſebius *was an* Arian *or no, ſignifys little to me, who am ſo far from being one, that I think 'em in a great Error, and declare, my Faith depends*

---

* *Epiſt.* 2. *p.* 68. Parum meâ intereſt, an *Euſebius* Arianus fuerit, necne, qui cum Arianis minime ſentio, imò eos in gravi Errore verſatos exiſtimo; & qui fidem meam ex ſolis Novi Teſtamenti Tabulis pendere profiteor, non ex *Euſebii* aliorumve Patrum Scriptis.

on the Books of the New Teſtament alone, and not on the Writings of Euſebius, *or any other Father.* Two Pages farther, he ſays, * *I neither approve the Opinion of the* Arians, *nor the* Photinians *way of interpreting thoſe Scriptures which ſpeak of the Divinity of Chriſt.* He aſſures alſo, in the ſame Letter, that † *neither of thoſe Opinions,* viz. Arian, *or* Socinian, *can be learn'd from* his *Writings.*

In his *Parrhaſiana,* diſproving the Calumnys of ſome *German* Divines, a very rigid ſort of People, he ſays in ſo many Words, ‖ *He is no-wiſe a Socinian.* And in another place; ** *If they underſtand by it, the* DIVINITY *of the* SON, *his diſtinction from the* FATHER, *and the Redemption of Mankind, Mr.* Le Clerc *is more convinc'd of theſe things than the moſt zealous* Cocceian *of 'em all.*

He has one Paſſage in this Chapter that ſtrikes at the very Root of Socinianiſm, which, you know, Sir, is, that the Doctrine of the TRINITY is perfectly unintelligible; hence they infer'd 'twas a Contradiction, and, in the next place, falſe: And becauſe Mr. *Le Clerc* ſo handſomly removes all theſe Pretences, I will tranſcribe the Paſſage at large.

---

* *Pag.* 70. Nec Arianorum probo ſententiam, nec eam rationem, quâ Photiniani Scripturæ loca de Chriſti Divinitate interpretantur.

† *Pag.* 71. Certè neutram harum opinionum, ex meis libellis haurire potuit.

‖ *Tom.* 1. *Pag.* 405. Mr. *L. C.* n'eſt nullement Socinien, *&c.*

** *Ibid. Pag.* 435. Que ſi l'on entendoit par là la Divinité du Fils, ſa diſtinction d'avec le Pere, & la redemtion du genre humain; Mr. *L. C.* en eſt plus convaincu que ne le ſont les plus zeléz Cocceiens.

* *Not that, according to Mr.* Le Clerc's *Principles, we muſt expect to have clear and compleat Ideas of all things Revelation contains, or perfectly to underſtand all it ſays. He is far from thinking ſo; and with all Men in their Senſes, believes there is an infinite Number of Things in* God, *and Divine Matters, which we know nothing at all of, or underſtand very imperfectly. But we muſt not confound this Obſcurity with what we call Contradiction, which is not to*

---

* *Parrhaſian. Tom.* 1. *Pag.* 418. Ce n'eſt pas que, ſelon les principes de Mr. *L. C.* nous devions avoir des idées claires, & complettes de tous les objets que la Revelation renferme, ni entendre parfaitment tout ce qu'elle nous dit. Il eſt très-éloigné de cette penſée. Il y a, ſelon lui comme ſelons tous ceux qui n'ont pas perdu le ſens, une infinité de choſes dans Dieu & dans les choſes divines, que nous ne comprenons point du tout, ou que nous n'entendons que trés imparfaitment. Mais il ne faut point confondre cette obſcurité avec ce qu'on appelle contradiction, qui ne ſe trouve point dans ce qui eſt vrai. Il ne faut pas non plus s'imaginer d'en ſavoir plus, que ce qui nous a été révelé; mais ſe contenter de cela, ſans y rien ajoûter. Il y a dans les choſes divines des myſteres, que nous ne pénetrerons jamais, & dont nous avons neanmoins des preuves aſſurées dans la Révelation, & quelquefois même dans la Raiſon, comme Mr. *L. C.* l'a fait voir dans ſa *Pneumatologie.* Par Exemple, les Apôtres parlent du Meſſie, non ſeulement comme d'un homme, mais encore dans les mémes termes, que de Dieu le Pere, & ils lui attribuent la Creation du Monde; ce qui nous fait comprendre qu'ils ne l'ont nullement regardé comme un ſimple homme, mais comme étant uni a la Divinité, d'une maniere ſi étroite, qu'on peut lui attribuer ce que Dieu a fait long-temps avant qu'il nâquit. Mais il n'y a Perſonne, qui puiſſe définir la maniere de cette union & s'en forme une idée claire. Que faut il donc faire? Acquieſcer dans l'idée génerale & confuſe, que nous en pouvons tirer de l'Ecriture Sainte, & n'expliquer pas ce que nous ne ſavons point, ou impoſer aux autres la néceſſité de croire nos explications particulieres. La Raiſon nous apprend que Dieu a créé le Monde du néant, mais il n'y a Perſonne, qui puiſſe ſavoir la maniére de cette action Divine.

be found in any thing that is true. Nor shou'd we suppose we know more than Revelation has expres's'd, but content our selves with that, and not presume to make Additions. There are Mysterys in divine things we shall never be able to penetrate; of which notwithstanding we have certain Proofs from Revelation, and sometimes even from Reason, as Mr. Le Clerc *has shewn in his* Pneumatology. *For Example: The Apostles speak of the* MESSIAH, *not only as of a Man, but in the very same Terms as of* GOD *the* FATHER, *and ascribe to HIM the Creation of the World: whence 'tis plain, they in no wise look'd on Him as a Man only, but as united to the* DIVINITY *in so close a manner, that we may truly ascribe to HIM those things which were done by* GOD *long before HE was born. But no Man can define the manner of this Union, and form a clear Idea of it. What's to be done then in this Case? We shou'd acquiesce in the general obscure Idea we can collect from Scripture, and not go about to explain what we don't understand, nor impose a Necessity of believing our particular Explications upon other Men. Reason teaches us that* GOD *created the World out of Nothing, but no body can comprehend the manner of that divine Action.*

This may suffice in behalf of Mr. *Le Clerc*, tho more might be added from his Writings: but I think nothing can be more plain and expres's than this. By which you may observe, Sir, what a Liberty our Author takes: and I must confes's, 'tis not without some Indignation I see all these learned Gentlemen I have mention'd, together with others, so scornfully and unhandsomly treated. And when Learning and Piety, Innocence, Dignitys and Honours are thus vilify'd and trampl'd on; who can see it unconcern'd, and *withhold himself from speaking?* Especially if we add to the rest, his barbarous Usage of the incompa-

rable *Grotius*, a Man who is ſcarce to be equal'd in all his different Capacitys, and whoſe ſingular Abilitys have ſafely plac'd him out of the reach of Envy.

Grotius falls under Mr. *Wall*'s Diſpleaſure, for being *guilty*, as he imagines, *of a foul Impoſture, when he went about to diſprove the antient Practice of Infant-Baptiſm* from St. *Gregory Nazianzen*'s 40th Oration, which is concerning Baptiſm: whence he briskly obſerves, that *a great Stock of Learning does not always cure that Narrowneſs of Soul, by which ſome People are inclin'd to do any mean and foul thing, to favour a Side, or ſet up a Party.*

'Tis a high Imputation you'll ſay, Sir, on ſo great a Man; but if *Grotius* is really ſo baſe, it muſt be acknowledg'd he is beyond Excuſe, and Mr. *Wall* has been very kind to him; and his Learning and Station ſhou'd not ſecure him from a harſher Cenſure: And on the other hand, if it prove a bare Allegation, and not true, let his Impeacher look to that, and prepare to anſwer it as well as he can, before that juſt Judg, who loves Righteouſneſs, and ſees to the Bottom of our moſt ſecret Deſigns. I am tempted to believe, (and what he ſays in another place, *viz.* Part II. p. 21, *&c.* bears me out in it) that his own Conſcience tells him he wrongs *Grotius*. Perhaps he does it on purpoſe to have an Opportunity to criticize on him, and let the World ſee how much he is an Over-match for him: But judg of his Succeſs by the ſequel.

The Words of *Grotius* which Mr. *Wall* particularly refers to, are theſe: * *The Senſe* (viz. of a Cita-

* *Annot. in Matth.* 19. 14. Senſus eſt, veniant ad Chriſtum ut inſtituantur, non ut baptizentur, niſi poſtquam vim Baptiſmi intellexerint, Nazianzenus agens de iis qui ſine Bap-

Citation from *Tertullian*) *is, Let them come to* CHRIST *to be taught, not to be baptiz'd, till they can understand the Force of Baptism.* Nazianzen *speaking of such as dy'd without Baptism, instances in such as were not baptiz'd, διὰ νηπιότητα, by reason of their Infancy. And the same* Nazianzen *himself, tho a Bishop's Son, and a long time train'd up under his Father's Care, was not baptiz'd till he came to Age, as he tells us in his own Life.*

Grotius begins this Annotation with observing, that the Custom of baptizing Infants was grounded on these words of our SAVIOUR, among others; *Suffer little Children to come unto me*: and that it appears from St. *Austin*, St. *Cyprian*, &c. to have been practis'd by the antient Church; but withal remarks from *Tertullian*, that the precise Age it was to be administer'd at in his time was undetermin'd, and left to every one's Discretion. And here immediately follow the words I have just now transcrib'd.

Now can it be pretended from hence, that *Grotius* went *about here to disprove the antient Practice of Infant-Baptism*; when 'tis plain he first pleads for its Lawfulness and Antiquity, and even afterwards can mean no more than that it was not thought so indispensably necessary, but it might be defer'd, if the Parents pleas'd, to a more advanc'd Age? And that they actually did so, he has put beyond all Contradiction by the single Instance of *Nazianzen* the Elder, if he had brought no more. And Mr. *Wall* confesses this is all *Grotius* intended, when he says, *Grotius did not main-*

Baptismo decedunt, exemplum ponit in iis quibus Baptismus non contigit διὰ νηπιότητα. Atque is ipse Nazianzenus, Episcopi cum esset Filius, Patris sub cura diutissimè educatus, baptizatus non fuit nisi cum ex ephebis exiisset, ut ipse in vita sua nos docet.

tain there was ever any Church, or any time in which Infant-Baptiſm was not us'd. Pray obſerve how unfairly Mr. *Wall* deals with him. But *Grotius* had ſo expreſly declar'd his Opinion, that 'twas impoſſible he ſhou'd be miſunderſtood; for the general Concluſion he at laſt draws from all his Arguments which oppoſe Infant-Baptiſm, is this: * *But as all this ſhews the Liberty, Antiquity and Difference of the Cuſtom, ſo it argues nothing at all, for refuſing Baptiſm to Infants whom the Parents offer.* How cou'd Mr. *Wall*, after reading this, ſay, *he went about to diſprove Infant-Baptiſm?* If Mr. *Wall* underſtood the Greek as well as *Grotius*, and had but a ſmall ſhare of his Penetration and Sincerity, he wou'd not have taken this occaſion to cavil, notwithſtanding he finds ſo great a pleaſure in it.

Whoever has an Opinion of Grotius's *Sincerity*, Mr. *Wall* fancies, *muſt bluſh to read* that Paſſage in St. *Gregory*, *together with his Annotations on* Mat. 19. 14. But he is very much miſtaken, Sir, for *an Excuſe may without any Difficulty be made for him*, and need not ſuppoſe *he took the Quotation from Somebody at ſecond hand neither*, viz. by ſhewing that St. *Gregory*, by the Phraſe in diſpute, at leaſt might intend ſuch Children as chanc'd to miſs of Baptiſm thro their Parents Fault; who being allow'd to ſuſpend it, on account of their Infancy, to a later Seaſon, perhaps abus'd this Liberty, and ſometimes put it off ſo long, that by one means or other the Children dy'd without it. *Grotius* might think it reaſonable to underſtand him thus, from St. *Gregory*'s way of expreſſing

* *Annotat. Matth.* xix. 14. Cæterum iſta ſicut libertatem, vetuſtatem & conſuetudinis differentiam indicant, ita nihil affecunt cur repudiandus ſit Baptiſmus infantium, quos parentes, &c. conſecrandos offerunt.

himſelf;

himſelf; for οἱ δὲ εἰσὶν ἐν δυνάμει τῦ δέχεσθαι διὰ νηπιότητα, &c. cannot admit of the fallacious Turn Mr. *Wall* gives it, but muſt be render'd, *Who are not in a Capacity to receive it*, or *can't receive it becauſe of their Infancy*. For I never yet obſerv'd, nor I believe better *Grecians* than Mr. *Wall* and my ſelf, that εἶναι ἐν δυνάμει ſignifies *to have in one's Power*: And becauſe I wou'd not rely on my own knowledg too much, I conſulted *Stephens*, who was utterly ignorant alſo of this new Conſtruction; he has the *Greek* Phraſe exactly, and tranſlates it as I have done. And one wou'd have thought, *Epictetus*'s celebrated Diſtinction of *Things, which are, and are not in our own Power*, might have taught Mr. *Wall* how that Senſe is to be expreſs'd in Greek. Beſides, *Grotius* was too able a Man to commit ſo groſs an Error; and it ſeems more probable that he took St. *Gregory* right, if you conſider (which *Grotius* muſt certainly know, and Mr. *Wall* confeſſes) that it was common at that time for People, for ſome Reaſon or other, to let their Children go without Baptiſm many years: And even, in the Oration before us, St. *Gregory* adviſes People to delay their Childrens Baptiſm, *till they are capable to hear and anſwer ſome of the Holy Words*, as our Author tranſlates the Paſſage. All which Conſiderations make it almoſt neceſſary to underſtand the Paſſage as *Grotius* did, who therefore can't be thought guilty of ſuch a baſe Deſign as our Author charges on him. And therefore to uſe ſomething better than his own Logick, I won't ſay *a great ſtock of Learning*, but I find a great ſtock of Aſſurance is not always an infallible Sign that an Author is not inſlav'd to *that Narrowneſs of Soul, by which ſome People are inclin'd to do any mean and foul thing to favour a Side*, or make a Figure in *a Party*.

What

What Mr. *Wall* objects againſt *Grotius*, in relation to the *Neocæſarian* Council, may be eaſily anſwer'd likewiſe, by comparing with but moderate Attention what he and they have writ. According to our Author's own Repreſentation of it, any one who goes about it with ever ſo good a will, muſt find it difficult to ſee wherein *Grotius* is to be blam'd. As to the Words of the Council, Mr. *Wall* acknowledges they are ſo ambiguous in themſelves, that they may be fairly underſtood in favour of either Party. And as to the laſt Clauſe, which is the principal Ground of the Controverſy, he can't deny but *Balſamon*, who was Patriarch of *Antioch*, and *Zonaras*, who had been Secretary to the Emperor *Alexis Comnenus*, both of them *Grecians* and learned Men, did underſtand it in the Senſe *Grotius* cites 'em to confirm: Now upon theſe Conceſſions, I defy *Rivet*, *Marſhall*, and Mr. *Wall* himſelf, to faſten any thing upon *Grotius* like foul Dealing in the Matter. And pray mind, Sir, how Mr. *Wall*, tho he knows theſe three famous Men were unexceptionable Judges in the Greek Tongue, and expounded the Words in the Senſe he believes is not the true, forgetting what he had own'd before, pleaſantly affirms they do it contrary to the *Rules of Criticks*, and that *any Critick will obſerve* the peculiar *Notation of the word* ἰσῶ, determines his Senſe only to be true: That it ſhou'd be ſo plain and obvious for *any Critick* to obſerve, and yet theſe three, and indeed all others but himſelf, who to be ſure muſt be no Criticks of courſe, had not the Wit to ſee it; no more than he had to avoid the Abſurdity of ſaying the words of the Canon may be well enough underſtood either way, and yet that the Nature and Idiom of the Greek Language ſhew, they can be fairly underſtood but in one Senſe, *viz.* his own.

Tho

Tho he wou'd inſinuate indeed, that *the Opinions of* Balſamon *and* Zonaras are but of little moment, which by the way is a certain ſign they are againſt him, I hope they will appear otherwiſe, and far ſuperior to his Detractions and Criticiſms. The words of *Zonaras* are ſuch downright mere Antipædobaptiſm, expreſs'd ſo fully, without Reſerve, that I wonder Mr. *Wall* had the Courage to inſert 'em ſo largely. But his Tranſlation of 'em might have been more exact: for what he unintelligibly renders, I believe from the Latin Tranſlator whom he miſtakes, *For*, ſays it *(viz.* the Canon) *every one's own Choice is requiſite that they do profeſs themſelves Followers of* CHRIST, *and it appears by that Baptiſm which they receive with a willing Mind* (which Words I can't find have any Senſe) ſhou'd be engliſh'd thus (to vary from him as little as poſſible) *It ſays, in the Profeſſion of becoming Followers of* CHRIST, *every one's Choice is requir'd; and by this it appears whether they come to Holy Baptiſm with a willing Mind.* The Truth of what I ſay will appear from the Original, if you'll pleaſe to compare it, which Mr. *Wall* has omitted, I ſuppoſe, that his Senſe might paſs the better.

Balſamon is as direct to the ſame purpoſe: for, aſſigning another Reaſon why the unborn Child cou'd not be thought baptiz'd in the Mother's Baptiſm, beſides this, *that the Woman has nothing common in the matter of Baptiſm with the Child in her Womb*; he adds, *They* (viz. the Fathers of the Council) *ſay, every Perſon's own Profeſſion is neceſſary at Baptiſm; but now the Child unborn, being void of all Senſe, can't make the Profeſſions which are to be made at Baptiſm.* For thus I think the Senſe better expreſs'd than as Mr. *Wall* has render'd the Paſſage.

It appears from the whole, that *Grotius* cited theſe Paſſages very properly, and they prove at leaſt, that Ignorance and want of Deſire were a good reaſon againſt baptizing ſuch as were not able to make and declare their Choice: And both theſe Commentators expreſſing this ſo amply, have made it probable, that ſuch Children at that time were not, or however, according to them, needed not be baptiz'd, eſpecially if there was no apparent danger of their Dying. Any one who ſhall read over their Comments with an unbiaſs'd Mind, will ſee the Writers were as much for the Liberty and Indifference of Pædobaptiſm, as either of the *Gregorys*, and *Tertullian* is ſuppos'd to have been; otherwiſe their arguing is unaccountably abſurd. But I can't tell how to think two ſuch Men, and according to their Interpretation the whole Council too, ſhou'd make uſe of what Mr. *Wall* calls ſuch *leaden-headed Logick*.

I own *Balſamon*, or perhaps ſome body elſe, has ſubjoin'd, at the end of his Comment, ſome words which allow Children may be brought to Baptiſm by Sponſors: the Place is a little obſcure, and I can't be poſitive of the perfect Senſe of it; but it does not ſeem at all to do our Author the Service he is willing to believe it does. Κατὰ τίθενται, in the latter Clauſe, ſhou'd not be tranſlated ſo readily by *Promiſe*; for the Profeſſion, requir'd at Baptiſm, is expreſs'd every where elſe in theſe Citations, by ὁμολογία and ὁμολογεῖν. But let this be as it will, if *Balſamon* does here countenance Infant-Baptiſm, 'tis no more than what I have ſhewn *Grotius* did too; and therefore theſe words ſhou'd not be urg'd againſt him, ſince they are conſiſtent enough with the *Liberty* and *Indifference* he pleads for.

Mr.

Mr. *Wall* endeavours to ſtrengthen his Suppoſition, from the Diſpute between St. *Auſtin* and *Pelagius*. But this will do him no Service, if you conſider their Diſpute was not, whether Infants ſhou'd be baptiz'd or no, but for what end they were baptiz'd: and he ſhou'd not have ſaid, *they do declare that they never read or heard of any Chriſtians that were againſt Infant-Baptiſm*; but, which had been truer, that *Pelagius* did not contradict St. *Auſtin*, when he declar'd he never heard of any that deny'd Baptiſm was given *for Remiſſion of Sins*, as perhaps I may have occaſion to ſhew hereafter.

I beg leave now to apply what is ſaid above more cloſely to my Deſign, by remarking, that a Man, who is ſo free with Perſons in ſuch Reputation, will take a much greater Liberty, 'tis to be ſuſpected, with the poor deſpis'd Antipædobaptiſts; and I deſire therefore you will be pleas'd to read him with Diffidence and Circumſpection.

Nor indeed has he by abundance acted the Part of a credible Hiſtorian towards us; tho he makes a Shew of treating us with extraordinary Tenderneſs and Reſpect. But 'tis all aſſum'd and hollow, and may be eaſily ſeen thro; and he conveys his Aſperſions the more ſecurely by it, and with leſs Suſpicion ſtabs our Reputation. He carefully affects to ſtile us Antipædobaptiſts quite thro his Book, becauſe forſooth he wou'd avoid caſting any Reflections on us; but he cou'd not forbear diſcovering how uneaſy he is at the Reſtraint he laid on himſelf: and ſo after he has painted *Anabaptiſm* in no very pleaſing Colours, he as carefully lets you know *, Sir, we deſerve that *reproachful* Name, tho ſince we diſown it, he has not given it us.

* Part II. pag. 99.

I remember three ſeveral Places, where he is ſo incautious as to confeſs he is in a very willing Humour to believe and ſuppoſe any thing, tho upon no ground, ſo it does but favour his Deſign: So when he finds *Bilius* had ſaid, *Perſons came later to Baptiſm* in the Primitive Times than *now-a-days*, which is moſt directly to deny Infant-Baptiſm was practis'd in the Primitive Church; Mr. *Wall* is ſo hard put to it, he can only relieve himſelf by reſolving * to *believe, if one were to look over* Bilius's *Writings, one ſhou'd find that this was not his ſettled Opinion.* He has the ſame Dexterity in other Places, where he ſays, *All I believe this learned Man wou'd ſay (for I have not the Book)* &c. and *ſo, for ought I know, do all the reſt of the* Eaſtern, *&c.* a Sign he's powerfully inclin'd to fancy what he pleaſes ſhou'd be true. How often he uſes this notable Expedient, is not readily diſcover'd; but 'tis very reaſonably infer'd, from theſe open Confeſſions, he imploys it where he is not ſo kind as to give us warning.

He builds on this ſort of Arguments, when he wou'd reproach us with ſomething he has no other Evidence for; as may be ſeen by ſeveral Paſſages in his Account of *the preſent State of the Antipædobaptiſts in* England: and of a-piece with it is his ſo eaſily receiving and officiouſly reporting every uncertain Rumour that had reach'd his Ears. If he has but heard that any one, or a few Perſons at moſt, who call'd themſelves, or were call'd by others *Anabaptiſts*, have ever maintain'd or practis'd ſuch things, as may enrage People againſt us, and expoſe us to the Scorn and Fury of the leſs thinking bigotted part of thoſe from whom we diſſent, he does not forget it. Thus he inſinuates, † that we countenance, at leaſt, and have among

* Part II. p. 20. † Part II. p. 223.

us,

us, ſome who deny the Human Nature of our LORD CHRIST. This at beſt is ſpitefully enough repreſented: But I proteſt, for my part, I don't know there is ſo much as a ſingle Man in our Body who dares impiouſly deny ſo great a Fundamental of the Chriſtian Faith. We are ſure ſuch an one can be no Chriſtian; and if there be any ſuch, we diſown 'em all, and their pernicious Hereſy, which we are firmly perſuaded aims at no leſs than the utter Deſtruction of Chriſtianity it ſelf. As invidious is his relating the ſcandalous Story about Mr. *Hicks*; which, were it as true as it is falſe, has been equal'd and outdone by ſome of our Author's Communion: and therefore notwithſtanding this, we may ſtill be reckon'd as loyal to the Government as themſelves. But ſince he is forc'd to confeſs, that no more than *two Perſons only appear'd to have been guilty*, he ought in Honour, and in reſpect to the Oaths of thoſe of his own Party, to have left the Scandal in the Obſcurity it deſerves, *&c.* I am,

SIR,

Yours, *&c.*

JOHN GALE.

LETTER II.

The private Opinions of a few, not justly inserted in the History of the whole Body. There are probably ill Men among us, as well as among others. Some of our Author's invidious Insinuations. Our Adversarys, instead of railing, shou'd endeavour to convince us from Revelation, or Reason, or Antiquity. If their Reflections were true, our Reputation can't suffer much. We are not guilty of the hated Opinions Mr. Wall *loads us with. Our Separation easy to be justify'd. Mr.* Wall *has not sufficiently shewn wherein the Sin of Schism consists. He only explains it in general, by* Division, Separation, *&c. The true Notion of Schism. It may either be lawful or unlawful. Who are Schismaticks. Not they who go out from a Communion they were before join'd with, but those who unnecessarily give or take the Occasion; or continue separate without a just Cause. It being lawful in some Cases, and unlawful in others to separate, 'tis examin'd what will justify a Separation. Mr.* Wall's *Distinction between Fundamentals and Non-Fundamentals, tho good in it self, is insufficient, unless he had determin'd what are Fundamentals, and what not. A Rule to know these.* CHRIST *alone can determine what is Necessary; and what he has not expresly made so, is not so. 'Tis useful to distinguish between Things necessary to Salvation, and Things only necessary to the Constitution of a true Gospel-Church. This Distinction well-grounded, because the Qualifications of a Christian and a Church are very different. An Error in what is essential to the Constitution of a Church*

Church only, a ſufficient warrant to ſeparate from a Community in ſuch Error. Which is alſo confirm'd from ſome of Mr. Wall's *own Words. Agreement in the Fundamentals of Religion not a ſufficient Reaſon againſt Separation, as Mr.* Wall *wou'd urge it. Turn'd againſt himſelf. Therefore his Arguments tend to nothing ſo much as Confuſion. Tho it ſhou'd be allow'd, that we ought to ſubmit all things purely indifferent, to the Determinations of our Superiors; this wou'd make but very little, if at all, in Mr.* Wall's *favour. It does not follow, that Perſons who think they ought not to renounce Communion for ſmaller Matters, muſt therefore conſtantly conform in thoſe things, and neglect what they think is better. If the Ceremonys are not of ſo much Conſequence, as to juſtify the Diſſenters in their Separation; neither will they juſtify the Church in ſo unneceſſarily inſiſting on 'em. Theſe things, ſaid to be indifferent in themſelves, by being the occaſions of Diviſions, ceaſe to be indifferent, and become unlawful. The Diſſenters are verily perſuaded, the things for which they diſſent, are not ſo indifferent as is pretended. The Church's Power of making Laws for its own Government, of no ſervice to Mr.* Wall. *Things in themſelves lawful, may be ſo circumſtantiated, as to become unlawful. As the Caſe ſtands at preſent, the Diſſenters are oblig'd to diſſent from the National Church. The uncharitable Obſtinacy of our Adverſarys. The Separation of the Antipædobaptiſts particularly defended. Mr.* Wall *pretends, that tho they are right, they have no ground to ſeparate. The Antipædobaptiſt Notion ſtated. The Time and Manner of receiving Baptiſm, ſo far as it relates to our preſent Diſpute, are Fundamentals. That can't be true Baptiſm, which differs from true Baptiſm. Our Separation juſtify'd by the Definition of a Church, in the 19th Article of the Church of*

England. *We ought not to unite with Perſons unbaptiz'd. True Baptiſm neceſſary to Church-Membership. The Words of the Inſtitution, the beſt Rule by which to judg what is true Baptiſm. We refuſe to communicate with the Church of* England, *for the ſame Reaſon for which ſhe refuſes to communicate with Perſons ſhe eſteems unbaptiz'd. Mr.* Wall's *Terms of Union very partial and unreaſonable. We are oblig'd to the Toleration for the general Forbearance Mr.* Wall *boaſts of. And deſire to remain in the Hands of her Majeſty and Parliaments under* GOD, *who have hitherto ſo kindly ſecur'd us. A fair Propoſal, in order to eſtabliſh Unity among us. Mr.* Wall *a Friend to Perſecutions for Religion. The Concluſion.*

SIR,

WHat I have already ſaid in my former, inſtead of more, may ſerve for a Specimen of Mr. *Wall*'s Moderation and Ingenuity. What can be more unfair, than to repreſent and judg of a whole Body by the odd ſingular Opinions of a few particular Men in it? Mr. *Wall*, and all Men, wou'd juſtly eſteem him an abuſive Hiſtorian, who, reciting the Doctines of the Church of *England*, ſhou'd charge her with the miſerable Abſurdity of the Church of *Rome*, *Tranſubſtantiation*, only becauſe Biſhop *Bramhall* ſays, *No genuine Son of the Church of* England *did ever deny the true real Preſence*; or the gainful Article of *Purgatory*, becauſe Mr. *Dodwell* * has unaccountably aſſerted, and cited the *Liturgys* publiſh'd by Primate *Uſher*, to prove, that the Dead, not excepting *the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apoſtles, Martyrs, and even the Bleſſed Virgin herſelf, are now in Slavery to the Devil:* And adding in the next Page, that

* *Epiſtolary Diſcourſe*, p. 258.

by

by this Slavery he does not mean they are liable to any Puniſhments, but only certain Moleſtations and *Diſquietudes*, from which they † *may be reliev'd by the Prayers of the Living*. Had *Bellarmine* been to argue this Notion of a Purgatory with Mr. *Dodwell*, he wou'd have deſir'd no greater Conceſſions.

That Man wou'd be juſtly blam'd, who ſhou'd pretend the Church of *England* teaches CHRIST's Sacrifice of Himſelf was not Expiatory for Sin, or that the Martyrs are capable of making the like Expiation; becauſe Mr. *Dodwell* in another place ‖ ventures at the extravagant Aſſertion, that *this Power and Virtue is common to* CHRIST *and His Myſtical Body:* ſpeaking more particularly of the Primitive Martyrs making their Blood almoſt equally effectual with CHRIST's, to the purging away Sin; and accounting them ſo many expiatory Sacrifices for Sin; directly contrary to the Determination of the holy Penman, that CHRIST, Heb. ix. 26. *once in the End of the World hath appear'd to put away Sin by the Sacrifice of Himſelf.* (Cap. x. ver. 10.) *Which was offer'd once for all.* (Ver. 12.) *One Sacrifice for Sins for ever.* (Ver. 14.) *For by one Offering He hath perfected for ever them that are ſanctify'd.* (Ver. 18.) And, *There is no more Offering for Sin.*

'Twou'd be ſhameful Injuſtice to make the Church anſwerable for all the ſtrange, nay ſometimes blaſphemous and atheiſtical Fancys, and bad Actions of her pretended Sons. Too great a part of the Clergy, 'tis notorious, are either open nonjuring Jacobites, or ſecret, and therefore more miſchievous, Highflyers; entirely in the

† *Epiſtolary Diſcourſes*, p. 259.

‖ Diſſertat. Cyprianic. 13. §. 36. Et vero *Nominis* Ratio ſuadet potius ut ſit Virtus hæc CHRISTO cum ejuſdem *Myſtico Corpore* communis.

Pretender's Intereſt, and as hearty Friends to Popiſh Tyranny and Superſtition, as ever was the *Laudean* Faction. What a Number is there of 'em, who glory in being call'd High-Church-Men, and carefully keep up the Diſtinction, notwithſtanding the Queen and Parliament have often declar'd ſuch to be dangerous Enemys to Church and State? But to aſcribe the Diſloyaltys, Corruptions, and pernicious Doctrines of theſe Men to the Church, tho they have had the Fortune to worm themſelves into ſome Share of her Dignitys, wou'd be diſingenuous, and every honeſt Man wou'd abhor it.

Of the Twelve our LORD had choſen, *one was a Devil*; and I ſhall never pretend no ſuch have crept in among us, who, whether deſignedly or no, prejudice thoſe they ſhelter with, and the Chriſtian Religion in general. Undoubtedly, there are privately among us, as well as others, weak and ignorant, and perhaps too, ſome ill-meaning People, who are fond of peculiar Conceits, and idle extravagant Notions of their own framing. But this can be no fair Objection to the whole Body: For let any one ſhew me the Community whoſe Individuals are all correct and ſound, and not ſome of 'em ſingular and faulty; which however are but as the Wens and unnatural Excreſcences in the human Body, which enter not into the Deſcription of the Body, but at moſt are only counted accidental Irregularitys it is liable too.

When Mr. *Wall* therefore, in order to make us look the more monſtrous, ſhuffles into his Impartial Account, as he calls it, of our preſent Opinions, the Freaks and Perſuaſions he has heard a ſingle Man, or a very few Perſons that have been in our Party, maintain; it looks very pitiful in him, and can impoſe only on ſuch Readers who are as willing to be deceiv'd as he deſir'd. And indeed

indeed, ſuch Readers only can bear his many miſchievous Inſinuations; a ſort of Ornament he ſeems fond of. I can't comprehend what cou'd poſſibly be his Deſign in his ſilly Excuſe for Mr. *Baxter*, who continu'd to charge us with a notorious Falſhood, even after all proper Care was taken to let him know it; nor what occaſion he had for his Innuendo, when he briefly mentions our Liberality to our Poor; adding in an invidious Parentheſis, that we attract the Multitude by this Artifice, and gain Proſelytes to ſtrengthen our Party. I wonder in my Heart what he thinks 'tis that attracts the Rich; for unleſs there are ſuch, the Poor are not like to be provided for: Is it that they ſeek Opportunitys to diſpenſe of their good Things to the neceſſitous and wretched? I'm afraid this wou'd be too great a Commendation of 'em; and Mr. *Wall* wou'd not willingly be guilty of ſuch a Suppoſition; he rather ſeems deſirous to have it ſuppos'd they are acted only by an unquiet factious Spirit: for what elſe can be his meaning in ſaying, * *They either out of Peeviſhneſs, or elſe being over-perſuaded by their Leaders, who find their Account in continuing ſeparate Bodys, whereof they may be Heads, do refuſe to join even in thoſe things wherein they agree in Opinion with us?*

Why alſo does he ſo often upbraid us with having had Jeſuits found among us, and take the Pains ſo induſtriouſly † to aggravate the Thing, unleſs to make us thought a troubleſom factious Party, and the Tools of diſaffected Men to divide and weaken the Proteſtant Intereſt? But ſuch Clamours only ſhew Paſſion and Diſtaſte in our Oppoſers, and are no Demonſtration they have either Truth or Juſtice on their ſide, and that we are in the Error. If theſe zealous Men wou'd ef-

* Part I. p. 96. † Part II. p. 282.

fectually ruin our Cauſe, they ſhou'd leave railing, and uſe their Strength to convince us from Revelation, or the Principles of Reaſon, or the Hiſtory of the Primitive Church, that we are the vile, novel, and humorous Sect they abuſively pretend. We invite 'em to the Trial, and are not apprehenſive of being worſted in the Iſſue; for we bottom our Cauſe on the ſtable Foundation of Scripture, Reaſon, and Primitive Practice. Does it not look as if they were conſcious that they can do us no Hurt from theſe Topicks, by their forſaking theſe Arguments, and endeavouring to oppreſs us by more popular Arts? as if they thought one of the moſt prevailing Arguments againſt us is, publiſhing and perſuading People to believe, that our Leaders are Romiſh Prieſts, or Perſons who are their Retainers, and do 'em Service. And they uſually ply us hard with theſe Reflections. Nothing can be more exemplary in this kind, than the heroick Exploits of *Featly*, *Baxter*, and *Ruſſen*; to mention no more.

But as we have already, ſo we ſhall ſee farther, as we proceed, that Mr. *Wall*'s Fidelity in relations of this nature, is not altogether ſo much to be truſted to, but we may fairly queſtion the Facts: Beſides, were theſe things true, our Reputation can't ſuffer much; for every one muſt needs be ſenſible, 'tis impoſſible always to be aware of thoſe buſy Intruders, who wear any Shape, and chuſe to mix in Societys they think dangerous to their Deſigns, to breed Corruptions and Diſorders there, and then get themſelves diſcover'd, in order to lay the whole Diſgrace on the Societys, and make them bear the Scandal. And Mr. *Wall* might have conſider'd, that even the National Church has not been free from ſuch Maſquers, who have found Means to open themſelves a Way to her Preferments and Profits. I need bring no other Teſti-

Teſtimony ſure of this, than a * Speech made in Parliament, *February* 9. 1640. by the Great Lord *Falkland*, a true Friend of the Church, according to the Character given him by our late ** Noble Engliſh *Thucydides*, who was himſelf too as firm a Patron of the Church as by Law eſtabliſh'd, as any in his Time; and that noble Lord's Complaint, therefore, can't be judg'd to come from Envy or Detraction.

But leſt all this ſhou'd not be effectual to expoſe us ſo much as he cou'd wiſh; to ſhew his real *Tenderneſs* towards us, he loads us farther with ſome of the moſt infamous and hated Opinions, which the generality of Chriſtians diſown, and the warm and eager anathematize with the greateſt Fury. And this Addition, perhaps, he thinks will weigh down our Scale.

If, indeed, the Things he taxes us with were true, I wou'd be ſilent on the Point; but they are ſo notoriouſly falſe, that I admire any Man, eſpecially one of Mr. *Wall*'s Order, cou'd perſuade himſelf to accuſe us of 'em. Socinianiſm is one of the blackeſt heretical Tenets, with moſt People, that infeſts the Chriſtian World: 'tis commonly thought ſo derogatory to our Redeemer's Honour, and ſo inconſiſtent with the Fundamentals of Chriſtianity, that all its Abettors may be juſtly treated like Infidels, and open Enemys of God and Religion. This, Mr. *Wall* knows, is much the more prevailing Temper, as well as it ſeems to be his own. And therefore, to expoſe us to a general Contempt, and to draw this Odium upon us, he takes care to inform you, that † *we have many* Socinians *among us:* inſinuating as if we countenanc'd 'em; and that ‖ *the old Here-*

* Ruſhworth. *Vol.* 4. *p.* 184. ** *Lord* Clarendon.
† Part II. p. 222. ‖ Ib. p. 265.

ticks, ſome of 'em, deny'd Him (viz. CHRIST) *to be* GOD; *and others of 'em deny'd Him to be properly Man: But theſe,* ſays he, *deny both, and ſay, He is neither* GOD, *nor properly Man.*

'Tis ſtrange, any one ſhou'd have the Face ſo boldly to affirm this, when himſelf, and all that are acquainted with us, know it to be utterly falſe. There are ſuch, I know, in the Church of *England*, tho ſhe deſervedly diſclaims 'em; and there may ſecretly be ſome with us; and ſo in all Partys: but they are ſo uncommon, or ſo conceal'd, that I don't know ſo much as one among us. And I need only appeal to our Author himſelf, to juſtify us from his own Calumny; for at another time, when he's not in quite ſo ill an Humour, he confeſſes, that tho we ‖ *have ſome Socinians who creep in among us, yet I have not heard,* ſays he, *of any Church or Congregation of 'em, that makes Profeſſion of that Doctrine; but on the contrary, that they that profeſs it openly, are rejected from their Communion.* And pray, what can we, or any Church in the World, do more to cleanſe our ſelves of that Leproſy? and yet he cou'd ſuffer himſelf to accuſe us of holding thoſe very Opinions, he here owns we endeavour to root out. Can this, Sir, and the other things I've been noting, flow from an honeſt good Mind?

I wou'd omit other Miſtakes, *&c.* of Mr. *Wall*; as his charging *Pelagianiſm*, and holding the *Mortality of the Soul*, upon us; which are very falſly imputed, in order to come to the grand Queſtion between us: but what he ſays of the Non-Neceſſity and Unreaſonableneſs of our Separation muſt not be paſs'd over without a Reflection, it ſeeming to be deſign'd to render us odious, by inſinu-

‖ Part II. p. 275.

ating,

ating, how much our censorious quarrelsom Spirit delights in Fractions and Divisions.

The Necessity and Reasonableness of a Separation from the Establish'd Church, you know, Sir, have been copiously treated by several eminent Men; and I think it no hard matter to vindicate ours from the strongest Objections rais'd against it: But this is not the Place, I shall therefore only make a short Reply to what Mr. *Wall* urges, because his Representation of the Thing may possibly too much have its design'd Effect, and do us a prejudice with your self, Sir, or others, into whose Hands these Letters may fall.

Mr. *Wall* begins his last * Chapter, which he calls *a Dissuasive from Separation*, with an Account of the great Sin and Mischief of Schism, which, he observes, all Men allow to be of a very heinous Nature; and he ought in Charity therefore, to suppose all Men as sollicitous to avoid the Guilt of it as himself; and kindly in assisting 'em to *flee from the Wrath which is to come*, he shou'd not only warn 'em of the Evils it produces, which they are already convinc'd of, but plainly shew wherein the Sin consists, that they may shun it the better. He has not done this distinctly enough, but constantly exclaims against Schism, without ever giving the true Notion of it, and proving particularly what it is, which was the Business of the Chapter. Had he clear'd up this, and then convicted us of it, he had triumph'd, and we wou'd have immediately put an end to our Separation.

Instead of this, he only explains it in general, by *Division, Separation, and breaking the Unity*; and, to make all Separatists from himself as black as may be †, wou'd have this Separation in general

* Part II. p. 382. † Part II. p. 383.

believ'd

believ'd no better, than what St. *Paul* calls *Hereſy*. And yet certainly he wou'd not have us underſtand all Diviſions, *&c.* are culpable Schiſms; for he ſuppoſes it lawful to ſeparate on account of Difference in Fundamentals, tho even then (which looks like a Contradiction) there is ‖ a Sin he ſeems to ſay in the Separation. So that he leaves the thing very obſcure, and, by ſome Paſſages, ſeems to think *he* may lawfully ſeparate from all who don't agree with him; but they, on the other hand, can't forſake him without a great Sin. Hence you ſee, Sir, how neceſſary it was to fix the right Notion of Schiſm, if our Author had intended his Diſſuaſive ſhou'd have had any Succeſs.

Briefly to ſupply this Defect: Tho Σχίσμα, you know, Sir, ſignifies literally a bare *Rent* or *Diviſion*, yet in the Eccleſiaſtical Senſe it either relates to the Diſſenſions among the Members of the ſame particular Church, as 1 *Cor.* xi. 18. or more commonly, as alſo in our preſent Diſpute, 'tis us'd for a needleſs and unjuſt occaſioning the Body of Chriſt's Church, which is but one, to be torn into different Communitys. 'Tis not ſo much the actual ſeparating, as the unjuſtly cauſing it, is the Sin. Schiſm, in the large Senſe of the Word, may be lawful or unlawful, as 'tis apply'd to one or t'other Party; for the Diviſion or Separation is mutual, and relates equally to both Sides that diſagree. Now Mr. *Wall* uſes the word undeterminately; and, which renders what he ſays perplex'd, confounds the different Meanings of it.

That we may proceed more clearly, I intend by Schiſmaticks ſuch as unneceſſarily cauſe Diviſions, and by Schiſm the great Sin ſuch are guilty of. In this Senſe only Schiſm is to be condemn'd as

‖ Part II. p. 399. lin. 4.

unlawful;

unlawful; and thus St. *Paul*, by a Periphraſis, calls Schiſmaticks not Separatiſts barely, but * *ſuch as cauſe Diviſions.* This I take to be the peculiar and proper Import of the Word, as it has been, and is now us'd in the Church.

Hence it follows, that not ſo much they who go out from a Communion they were join'd with before, are the Schiſmaticks, as thoſe who raſhly and unjuſtly either give or take occaſion ſo to ſeparate. Thus if the Church of *Rome*, by her Idolatrys and other Corruptions, makes it juſt and neceſſary to divide from her, ſhe commits the Schiſm or Separation, by rendring the Terms of Communion ſo unſafe and impracticable, and not our Forefathers, who wiſely follow'd the Apoſtle's Counſel, to † *come out from among 'em.*

In like manner, if any Church, thro length of time, and the Preſumptions and Miſmanagement of her Governors, degenerate into dangerous Errors and Corruptions, and a few Perſons obſerving it make proper Application to have 'em redreſs'd, and no Care is taken upon it; thoſe few wiſer and more conſcientious not only lawfully may, but are indiſpenſibly bound to renounce the Communion of ſuch unreaſonable Bigots. The other Side, tho, as it generally happens, by far the Majority, are the Schiſmaticks, in adhering ſo obſtinately to their Corruptions, which are incompatible with the Purity of a Church of CHRIST, and refuſing to join with the others in a Reformation of thoſe Abuſes, and endeavouring to reduce themſelves to a nearer Conformity with the Primitive Church.

The Caſe will be much the ſame in regard to thoſe who never were in Union, if they continue ſeparated upon inſufficient Grounds from a So-

---

* Rom. xvi. 17. † 2 Cor. vi. 17.

ciety;

ciety; which, if compar'd, has more Propertys of a Church than themſelves. This is formal Schiſm, which, as I ſaid, is being ſeparate and divided, without juſt Cauſe, from a true Church. And this will make it difficult for ſeveral Members, the Church of *England* is troubled with, to clear themſelves from the Guilt of Schiſm, in acknowledging that at *Rome* for a true Church, and yet ſeparating from her, if they are ſeparated, and not, as many ſuſpect, her real Friends, and reconcil'd to her in their Heart; tho for Deſigns beſt known to themſelves, they affect to appear otherwiſe, and ſo reproach her with Schiſm underhand, in ſuch manner as may not expoſe 'em to her Cenſure.

To return: By what has been ſaid, the Matter is brought to this Iſſue, that thoſe who unjuſtly give occaſion to ſeparate from the true Church, and thoſe who unjuſtly take it, with ſuch alſo as continue ununited without ſufficient Cauſe, are alone Schiſmaticks in the Scripture-Senſe, which is the right; and are therefore fairly reckon'd Enemys of the Croſs and Catholick Church of CHRIST.

But now ſince 'tis lawful in ſome Circumſtances to renounce Communion, and ſinful in others, it concerns us to examine what thoſe Circumſtances are, which may make Separation Schiſmatical or not; and indeed here the main Difficulty lies.

Mr. *Wall* offers to explain it, by diſtinguiſhing between fundamental Points, and ſuch as are not of the Foundation. An Error *in the Fundamentals of Religion*, he ſays*, *does put a Bar to our Communion with thoſe that teach it.* But for Miſtakes in matters of leſs moment, he thinks we have *St.* Paul's *Direction and Order to bear with one another, and receive one another into Communion, not-*

* Part II. p. 385.

withſtanding

withſtanding thoſe Differences; which indeed it muſt be allow'd are not ſufficient to warrant ſo deſperate a Remedy as *Separation*. But this Diſtinction, tho good in it ſelf, will however do little Service in the Caſe before us, becauſe we are ſtill to determine which are Fundamentals, and which are not; and I don't remember Mr. *Wall* has touch'd upon this: Nevertheleſs, I obſerve, he has made ſome Articles ſo, which I and Thouſands beſides can by no means grant him. I'll not ſingle 'em out, becauſe they ſignify little to our preſent Diſpute; but I mention'd the thing in groſs, to ſhew how requiſite it was for him to have taken ſome care to ſettle this Matter.

The Subject is too large for me to handle it thorowly: I ſhall therefore ſatisfy my ſelf with laying down but one Rule, which I believe will not be controverted, and perhaps might eaſily be ſhewn to be a very certain univerſal Guide to direct us at all times to diſtinguiſh Things *Neceſſary* and *Eſſential*, from *Uſeful* only. Not all things plainly contain'd in the Scriptures, as ſome expreſs themſelves too generally, but *ſuch alone as explicitely, or by very plain Conſequence, ſo as all Men, even the moſt ignorant and ſimple, by fairly reading and conſidering, may diſcern them to be declar'd neceſſary in the Scripture, which is our only infallible Guide on Earth; are all the fundamental and neceſſary Articles of the Chriſtian Church and Faith.* To illuſtrate it by an Example; 'tis ſaid directly, that *after they had ſung an Hymn, they went out into the Mount of* Olives; and, in another place, that Saul *was conſenting to* Stephen's *Death:* neither of which is a neceſſary Article that will endanger a Man's Salvation who queſtions it, or is ignorant of it, or, if it cou'd be ſuppos'd, ſhou'd miſunderſtand it. But when the LORD ſays, *This is Life Eternal, that they might know* THEE *the only true*

true GOD, *and* JESUS CHRIST, *whom thou haſt ſent*; and again, *Unleſs ye eat my Fleſh, and drink my Blood, ye have no part in me*; and, *without Faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe* GOD: None can be ſo blind as not to ſee that theſe, and many other ſuch Paſſages, are Points abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation under the Goſpel.

Our LORD, and He only, can teach us what things he indiſpenſibly requires of all to whom his Goſpel is preach'd; and we having no way to know his Will but by ſearching the Scriptures, it can't be queſtion'd but their Authority muſt be enough to determine the Things, which really are, and ought to be accounted neceſſary or not neceſſary by us; for no Power can alter what our LORD has there eſtabliſh'd.

'Twill be convenient here, to diſtinguiſh between things neceſſary only to Salvation, and thoſe which are neceſſary to the rightful Conſtitution of a true Goſpel-Church: for theſe are far from being one and the ſame. It wou'd be needleſs to go about to ſhew that this Diſtinction is well grounded; but Mr. *Wall* ſeeming not appris'd of it, or not to own it, I will venture to ſay ſomething to confirm it.

In order to this it may be obſerv'd, the Qualifications which make a true Chriſtian, and which conſtitute a true Church, are different. The Fundamentals of Chriſtianity may be found in a ſingle Man, but a ſingle Man can't have all the Eſſentials of a Church: And farther, a Body of Men may be good Chriſtians, Orthodox in all Fundamentals, and yet not able to form themſelves into a Church. 'Tis neceſſary indeed, that Church-Members be true Chriſtians, and free from fundamental Errors; but this alone does not conſtitute 'em a Church, which is not only a Body of faithful Men and Women, but they muſt be united together

gether in CHRIST's Name, ſo as that among them may be orderly perform'd the ſeveral Dutys requir'd in a Chriſtian Church.

Thus the Parliament for inſtance, and all our other Civil Societys, we'll charitably ſuppoſe, are good Chriſtians, that hold the Truth in all Godlineſs and Honeſty; yet no body ſure can pretend, when they are aſſembled in their Houſes under their Speakers, their ſole Heads as Parliaments, they are then a rightly conſtituted Church, where the Eccleſiaſtical Offices may be legally executed. So that tho Perſons may hold all the neceſſary Articles of Chriſtian Religion, by which they are, according to the New Covenant in CHRIST's Blood, intitled to Salvation; yet on ſome other accounts they cannot be thought to conſtitute a true Church.

The Conſequence therefore is unavoidable, that the Fundamentals of Chriſtian Religion, and a Chriſtian Church, are not altogether the ſame: And I think 'tis prov'd alſo from the Authority of the Church of *England*, which makes the due Adminiſtration of the Sacraments eſſential to the Being of a true Church, and yet charitably grants that of *Rome* to be in a ſalvable State; tho, for ſome Reaſons, their Salvation cannot but be thought very hazardous, and muſt be ſo as by Fire.

One of the neceſſary Qualitys of a true Church is, the Edification of the Members, which is our LORD's great end in founding Churches on Earth. If therefore all other Neceſſarys are retain'd, and by ſuperſtitiouſly adding ſome things, and preſumptuouſly altering others, the Converſion of Sinners, and the Edification of Believers is not promoted but hinder'd, that Church cannot be counted a true one.

Again:

Again: To miſtake in the Notion of a Church, and deny there ought to be an Order of Perſons lawfully ordain'd and ſet apart for the Altar, to preach the pure Word of GOD, and adminiſter the Sacraments, is an Error we may fall into, without endangering our Salvation, or the Foundations of Chriſtian Religion.

If the *Divine Right* of Epiſcopacy be queſtion'd, and the Nonjuring Biſhops rejected by the more judicious Part of the Church of *England*, and the Chimera of uninterrupted Succeſſion given up, tho we ſhou'd ſuppoſe them in the wrong and Mr. *Dodwell* in the right, he was certainly much too haſty in charging the preſent Church of *England* with Schiſm and Hereſy too; for tho thoſe things ſhou'd deſtroy the Being of a true Church, they do not endanger a Man's Salvation: So that I infer from the Principles of theſe rigid High-flyers, who diſown the preſent Conſtitution, and account themſelves another Church, different from that by Law Eſtabliſh'd, which they openly call Schiſmatical and Heretical, that all the Eſſentials of a Church are not neceſſary to Salvation. But on the other hand, you are to obſerve, Sir, tho to be right in the Eſſentials of a Church is not a Fundamental of Religion; yet to be right in the Fundamentals of Religion, is a neceſſary Article of a true Church; the Fundamentals of a Church including the neceſſary Articles of Chriſtianity, but not *vice versâ*. I ſpeak of a particular viſible Church, not of the univerſal inviſible One, which, perhaps, has no other Eſſentials than the neceſſary Articles of the Chriſtian Religion; for every true Chriſtian is a Member of the Catholick Church, tho he ſhou'd happen not to be in Communion with any viſible one. Is there not an apparent Diſtinction now between things neceſſary to make a true Chriſtian, and to make a true Church?

The

The first must be in every Member, but the others can be in the Aggregate or Body only.

'Twas not enough then for Mr. *Wall* to say, in general, that a Difference in Fundamentals is a sufficient ground of Separation, because it still remains a Question, whether both kinds of Fundamentals justify it? and if not, which sort can do it? By the tenour of the Chapter, he seems to mean the Fundamentals of Religion only, taking no notice of the others: But it may be ask'd, whether an Error in what relates to the Fundamental Constitution of a Church only, will not warrant a Separation from a Church in such an Error? One wou'd think this cou'd not possibly be deny'd: for let the necessary Qualifications, essential to the very Being of a Church, be what they will; if they are any of 'em wanting in a Community, of consequence there can be no Church; and we not only may, but ought to withdraw our selves from it: for 'tis only Schism to separate from a true Church, and not from one so corrupted.

For Instance: If a Civil Society, which we'll suppose to be perfectly right in all the Fundamentals of Religion, shou'd at any time presume to call themselves a True Church of Christ, and accordingly, without the proper Qualifications, assume the Sacred Offices, and administer the Holy Sacraments; I'm no way oblig'd to unite with 'em; or if already united, to continue so; but on the contrary, to come out from 'em, and disown their Presumption.

We see from hence, 'tis commendable in us to separate from any Body of Men, tho perfectly Orthodox in the substantial Articles of our most holy Religion, merely on account of their Errors in things which relate to the Fundamental Constitution of a Church. And tho Mr. *Wall*, as

I ſaid, does not mention this Diſtinction, or perhaps may not be willing to admit it; yet I have juſt recollected a Paſſage, where, in effect, he acknowledges all I have ſaid. After he has enumerated ſome (for I ſuppoſe he does not pretend 'em to be all) *Fundamental Articles of our Faith*, on account of Errors in which a Separation is on all hands allow'd lawful, he adds, * *But there are, beſides thoſe that hold ſuch Doctrines pernicious to the Foundation, abundance of Chriſtians that hold the ſame Faith in all Fundamental Points, who do yet live in Diviſions and Separation, diſowning and renouncing one another's Communion. 'Tis pity but theſe ſhou'd be reduc'd to the Unity which* CHRIST's *Body requires.*

In theſe Words, he plainly ſuppoſes a Society may hold *the ſame Faith* in all *Fundamental Points*, as he grants at leaſt ſome of the Diſſenters do, and yet not have Power to conſtitute a true Church; for if they were ſo, they wou'd be the ſame Church and Body of CHRIST, and no more divided than the particular Bodys of the Church of *England* are: but he denys this to the Diſſenters, by his blaming their Conduct in the Matter.

By this Paſſage alſo it appears, our Author can not only allow it lawful in ſome caſes, but even urge it as a Duty, to ſeparate from a Community which calls it ſelf a Church, and holds *all the Fundamental Points of Faith*, ſolely on account of ſome other things, in which he ſuppoſes it defective. Now, if this Society is a true Church, Mr. *Wall* will not pretend 'tis a Duty to ſeparate from ſuch a one. By adviſing the Members of that Society, therefore, to leave it, and unite themſelves to the Church of *England*, he

* Part II. p. 385.

implys, there are ſome other things neceſſary to the Conſtitution of a true Church, beſides Orthodoxy in Fundamental Articles of Faith; and plainly enough aſſerts, that we ought every one to renounce ſuch a Communion, while deſtitute of thoſe neceſſary things, whatever they be.

If 'tis lawful then to ſeparate from ſuch Chriſtians as we agree with in Fundamentals of Faith, 'tis ſtrange our Author ſhou'd make this ſame Agreement his only Reaſon againſt a Separation, as you ſee he does in the Words cited, as well as in ſeveral other places. Since *they hold all the Fundamental Points*, he ſays, they ought to unite, and not ſeparate; and yet, thoſe who *hold all the Fundamental Points*, lawfully may, and are ſometimes bound in Duty to ſeparate from one another. This looks like ſomething of an Abſurdity, not eaſy to be reconcil'd, and which unwary Men only can be guilty of. I believe 'twou'd puzzle you, Sir, to gueſs his Meaning, unleſs it be, that none may lawfully ſeparate from the Church of *England* that hold the *ſame Faith in all Fundamental Points*, becauſe he is of that Church, and the Diſſenters are oblig'd to leave their Churches, whereof our Author is not a Member, tho agreeing in the ſame Faith in all Fundamental Points, and join themſelves to his Communion. But I'm enclin'd to believe, our Author will have the Mortification to ſee, notwithſtanding the great Authority he aſſumes, that few, if any, will lay ſo much Streſs on his Example, as merely on account of that, or any thing he has written, ſo eaſily to forſake their own Churches, and fondly join themſelves to his.

But, beſides the Fallacy of this Argument, it turns as ſtrongly upon himſelf, and the Church whereof he's a Member: for let us put the Reverſe, and ſay, (which is true) the Church of *Eng-*

land is ſeparate from and diſowns the Diſſenters, as well as the Diſſenters are ſeparate from her: and if Agreement in the Fundamental Articles of Faith alone, according to Mr. *Wall*, is ſufficient to render Separation unlawful; I ask, on this Suppoſition, whether 'tis not as much the Duty of the Church, as of the Diſſenters, to end the Separation by conforming?

I can't, I confeſs, ſee but both ſides are equally affected with the Argument: for if 'tis incumbent on all in general to unite to thoſe they agree with in the Fundamentals of Faith, without reſpecting any thing elſe; the Obligation is as binding on the Church to conform to the Diſſenters, as it can be on the Diſſenters to conform to the Church.

And if ſo, to what purpoſe then does our Author inſiſt ſo much on this ſingle Topick, which, if it does any thing, is as full againſt the Church he undertakes to defend, as againſt any other that holds the ſame Fundamentals in Faith?

The Reaſoning of this Chapter, therefore, (tho I'm far from thinking it his Deſign) if juſtly purſu'd, wou'd produce Confuſion and Obſtinacy rather than any thing elſe. For it makes it neceſſary for the Diſſenters to alter their own Conſtitution, and receive that of the Church of *England*; which is oblig'd at the ſame time, and for the ſame Reaſon, to quit her Conſtitution, and receive that of the Diſſenters: and when this is done, the Separation will continue ſtill as wide as before, and they muſt change back again, and ſo go on in a conſtant Round; unleſs to fix the Matter, one ſide ſhall ſinfully reſolve to adhere to their old Form, in order to afford the other a poſſibility of knowing and performing their Duty. But 'twou'd be endleſs to trace this winding Maze of numerous Abſurditys quite thro. Mr. *Wall* indeed

deed thinks there is a great diſparity between the Church of *England* and the Diſſenters, and therefore the Argument does not oblige both alike.

They agree, 'tis true, in all Fundamentals of Religion, and the Difference between 'em is, in his opinion, concerning things of far leſs Moment, and in which that Church has ſignally the Advantage, in that ſhe is Eſtabliſh'd by the Civil Authority of the Land; and therefore in all things of an indifferent nature, ought to have the Preference, and be obey'd: and the Diſſenters not ſtanding on the ſame Foot, ought to ſubmit all ſuch things, and acquieſce in her Determinations.

Suppoſing this, and that nothing can be more juſt and reaſonable than in things purely indifferent, to be regulated by our Superiours; Mr. *Wall* muſt take this along with him as the Conſequence, That if any of the diſſenting Partys ſhou'd become the National Church by the Civil Power, they wou'd have a right to the ſame Privileges: for what the Magiſtrate's Eſtabliſhment gives to one, it cannot but give to another; and ſo what the Church of *England* is entitl'd to, here, by her Civil Eſtabliſhment, may be as juſtly claim'd by the Presbyterian Churches in *Scotland* and thoſe of the *United-Provinces*, and by the *Lutherans* in *Pruſſia*, *Sweden*, and *Denmark*; and if ſo, they muſt be ſuppos'd to want no Eſſentials to the Conſtitution of a true Church of CHRIST. 'Twill be as great a Sin and Schiſm, then, for any, even of the Church of *England* it ſelf, to divide from their Communion in thoſe States, as 'tis for the Diſſenters to ſeparate from the National Church here. And this ſeems to place the Nature and Guilt of Schiſm in nothing ſo much, as in the departing from any Church eſta-

bliſh'd by the Law of the Land. And therefore our Author ſays, * *The Church of* England *wou'd not approve of a Schiſm that ſhou'd be ſet up in any other Church, tho it were for the introducing thoſe ways of Worſhip which they have preſcrib'd.* But we ſee how true this is, by their building Churches, and ſending their Miniſters abroad; and from my Lord *Clarendon*'s and Dr. *Morley*'s refuſing to communicate with the *French* Proteſtants, under Monſieur *Claude*; and my Lord *Scudamore*'s withdrawing from the Church at *Charenton*. And the *Commons*, in a very memorable Declaration they drew up in the 19th of *James* I. ſay, *That if his Majeſty cannot by Treaty procure the Peace and Safety of his Children abroad, and of the true Profeſſors (in foreign Parts) of the ſame Religion profeſs'd by the Church of* England, *they wou'd, to their utmoſt Power, with their Lives and Fortunes, aſſiſt him ſo, as that he may be able to do it with his Sword.*

If there is no other Reaſon why the Diſſenters ſhou'd unite with the Church, but her being ſupported by Law, for in all other reſpects they're ſuppos'd equal, the Crime can be very little, if at all, leſs in the latter than in the former; and the Schiſm muſt be at leaſt almoſt equally ſinful in both, ſince there is no eſſential Ground, according to the Caſe ſuppos'd, on either ſide, to juſtify their Separation.

† *Various Ceremonys, Forms and Methods of ordering Church-Matters,* ‖ *particular Collects or Prayers, or Clauſes of Prayers,* Mr. *Wall* thinks ſhou'd not be eſteem'd by the Diſſenters a ſufficient Cauſe of Separation. But he knows the impoſing theſe things is thought a ſufficient Reaſon, and ſtrongly urg'd as ſuch too: and tho ſome can venture to go with him thus far, that upon the Suppoſition

* Part II. p. 394. † Part II. p. 392. ‖ Part II. p. 397.

theſe

these things do not evert the Foundation, as he somewhere phrases it, nor appear inconsistent with the Fundamentals of the Christian Church and Religion; they are then, indeed, no good Reason why any one shou'd renounce the *Communion of those Saints* who are pleas'd with these Ceremonys, *&c.* yet the same Persons think it will not therefore follow, that they must constantly conform to all those things, being verily persuaded they may have the liberty notwithstanding, commonly to exercise such Ceremonys only, as they like better, and think are more for God's Honour and the Good of their Souls. After this manner, Mr. *Wall* in effect allows * they might still continue to be the same Church; for as long as they don't renounce one another's Communion, but communicate together as shou'd seem convenient, they'll scarcely be more different than Cathedrals, Chappels, and Parish-Churches, whose Forms differ very much in several Particulars; some chusing the Cathedral Worship, and others the Parochial, and yet continuing to be the same Church.

Whether this wou'd be granted or no, Mr. *Wall* cannot possibly deny, but that if those *Ceremonys, &c.* are not of so much consequence as to justify a Separation, and that therefore the Dissenters are to blame in separating on their account; for the same reason, any Church, which unnecessarily insists on these things so stifly, is full as accessary to the Separation, and as guilty of it, and perhaps more guilty, than the † Dissenters themselves.

* Part II. p. 396.

† *This, with all its Consequences, tho they bear so hard on such Churches, is fully allow'd at several Turns by the warmest of*

For tho ſhe may think the Ceremonys decent and uſeful, *&c.* yet being of an indifferent Nature at beſt, they may either be us'd or laid aſide, as ſhall be found moſt convenient; and there is no more neceſſity from the things themſelves, for the uſe than the diſuſe of 'em: wherefore rigidly to reſolve to introduce 'em into the Church, or maintain 'em there, is unneceſſarily giving Occaſion to others not ſo well ſatisfy'd, to diſown thoſe things, and the Church which impoſes 'em.

And thus the common Pretence of their Uſefulneſs ceaſes; and inſtead of it, they become prejudicial, by creating Diviſions, which alters the Caſe quite, and renders 'em not merely indifferent, but unlawful. For tho they are indifferent in themſelves, I hope our Author won't imagine 'tis

---

of our Adverſarys, who really ruin their own Cauſe, and give up all the Diſſenters ask: Thus one of 'em particularly, who is uſually very angry, ſays, We may partake of other Mens Sins, by giving Offence or ſcandalous Example. *As Men are* Members *of* Society, *they ſtand* reſponſible *not only for the* poſitive Legality *of the Actions, as conſider'd in themſelves, and their own* Natures, *ſolely with reſpect to the* Subject Matter *of them; but alſo for their* Relative Conſequences, *as they may affect the* Conſciences *of* Others, *to which we are bound by the* Laws of Charity *to give no* Violation, Diſturbance, *or occaſion of Tranſgreſſing; and in all our* Deportment, *to conſult not only its* Lawfulneſs, *but its* Decency *and* Expediency, *with regard to our* Brethren, againſt whom *we may* ſin, *(as St.* Paul *ſays, in the admirable* State *of this Caſe,* 1 Cor. viii. 10.) *and* wound their weak Conſciences, and ſin againſt CHRIST. *Thus the* Abuſe *even of an* innocent Liberty *cannot be* juſtify'd *by a* good Intention; *and we are liable to anſwer for the* Fall *of thoſe to whom we become a* Stumbling-Block *and a* Rock of Offence. *Dr.* Sacheverell's *Sermon at the Aſſizes held at* Derby, Aug. 15. 1709. *Page* 12.

In giving Offence *by our Actions, we* uſe our Liberty for a Cloak of Maliciouſneſs; *and make what wou'd be otherwiſe* Innocent, *Culpable.* Ibid. p. 14.

an

an indifferent matter whether they prove an occaſion of rending the Body of CHRIST, nor queſtion its being far better, and, to be plain, their indiſpenſable Duty too, rather to alter and wholly give up what themſelves account ſo indifferent, than by retaining 'em, to endanger and break the Unity of the Church, which they find is impoſſible to be preſerv'd while they are retain'd.

'Tis ſtrange Men can exclaim ſo bitterly againſt Schiſm, (and GOD knows the Sin is black enough) and at the ſame time know in their Conſciences, they prefer their Humours and Opinions about external indifferent Matters, before the important Concern of the Peace and Edification of the Church.

There are ſeveral publick Defences made, by which all Men may ſee how far they can juſtify themſelves, who diſown the Church of *England*, even upon theſe trifling accounts, as they are thought; and on what Grounds they think it cannot be their Duty to yield to the National Church in her impoſing things which are really indifferent: But whether they are able to make a rational Defence of themſelves or no; nay, let us ſuppoſe that ſome can't, and yet are reſolv'd to continue their Separation; if ſuch unreaſonable miſtaken Men, or what you'll pleaſe to call 'em, are found among us, this will not leſſen the Church's Guilt, in ſo tenaciouſly continuing to throw the needleſs Occaſions in their way. Beſides, 'tis to be believ'd, all the Churches, and the greateſt part, if not every private Man of the Diſſenters, are ſatisfy'd in their Hearts, that the things they diſſent for, are not ſo indifferent as 'tis ſaid, nor can be receiv'd without corrupting the Purity of the Chriſtian Religion.

This

This conſiderably enhances their Fault, who in Matters they confeſs to be indifferent, thro no Neceſſity, but from the Motions of an arbitrary Temper only, will bear ſo hard upon the Conſciences of ſuch as cannot have the ſame Opinion, and drive 'em to the deſperate Dilemma of conforming againſt their Conſciences, or breaking the Unity of the Church. A more Chriſtian and becoming Diſpoſition in the governing Party, might have remov'd the whole Difficulty, without any Inconvenience at all, by kindly not inſiſting on thoſe things which ſome of their weaker Brethren cou'd not digeſt, and which they themſelves likewiſe are under no manner of Neceſſity to adhere to.

Every Society has Power, under the Supreme Authority, to frame By-Laws for it ſelf, to which all its Members are bound, and may be oblig'd to ſubmit. So the whole Church, undoubtedly, and every particular Part of it, may rightfully claim a Power, as far as CHRIST the Supreme Head permits, to make ſuch Orders and Conſtitutions as they ſhall judg proper for governing their ſeveral Bodys. And this is all that, with any face of Reaſon, can be demanded. But this will be of little or no Service in excuſing the Church, or condemning the Diſſenters, if we conſider, that this Power is not unlimited: but as the Laws of any Corporation are null, when repugnant to the general Inſtitutions of the Nation; ſo all Preſcriptions in the Church are of no force, and unlawful, when contrary to any which JESUS CHRIST, our great Legiſlator, has ordain'd; or when ſhe exceeds the lawful Bounds of her Power. And therefore, even thoſe who can allow the Church is poſſeſs'd of a Legiſlative Power in Matters purely indifferent, and are willing to ſuppoſe, that her Members are oblig'd to comply with her;

her; infer notwithſtanding, that if thoſe things, which are indifferent in themſelves, are circumſtantiated, as it often happens, ſo as to deſtroy any of our LORD's Precepts, we are diſcharg'd from Obedience to our ſubordinate Eccleſiaſtical Governors, and ſuch her Decrees are *ipſo facto* void.

Nay they farther aſſert, that tho the Church might lawfully exercíſe ſuch Power as is pleaded for in Matters of Liberty, yet as the Caſe ſtands at preſent, the Diſſenters in *England*, ſome of 'em at leaſt, are oblig'd to ſeparate from the National Church, who, as they think, by miſuſing her Power, has render'd the Terms of Communion unlawful: or if the Terms are not ſo themſelves, yet they are apt to ſuppoſe ſhe is as much to blame as the Diſſenters, if by arbitrary Impoſitions ſhe breaks in on Fundamental Laws, and exceeds her Commiſſion; and by narrowing the Gate, prevents many from entring into the Church, to her own great Injury, whoſe Growth her Governors are bound, by all lawful Means, to advance.

Peace and Unity are ſtrictly enjoin'd, and ſhou'd be the particular Care of thoſe whom *the Holy Ghoſt has made Overſeers of the Flock*; and yet ſome Men deliberately and with pleaſure ſtudy inflexibly to maintain and impoſe thoſe things, which they know by Experience confound the Unity they preach, and ſhou'd preſerve. 'Tis a chief Part of their Office, with Tenderneſs, to inſtruct and relieve the Conſciences of the People; but they, on the contrary, oppreſs and perplex 'em, beyond what they are able to bear. Is this agreeable to Charity, thus deliberately to conſtrain us to what they count a Sin, and againſt which themſelves pronounce Damnation? *Diviſions, Schiſms, Separations, and whatſoever breaks*

the

the Unity of the Church, are plac'd, they ſay, * by St. *Paul* in the *Roll or Catalogue he gives of the Sins which are certainly damning; which they that practiſe, ſhall not inherit the Kingdom of GOD*, Gal. v. 19, 20, 21. And notwithſtanding this, they are ſo far from helping us to avoid the Danger, that they willfully lay the unneceſſary Stumbling-Blocks before us, which they are aſſur'd will, and do make us fall, in direct oppoſition to the Apoſtle's Counſel and Pattern †, who ſays, *But when ye ſin ſo againſt the Brethren, and wound their weak Conſcience, ye ſin againſt* CHRIST. *Wherefore, if Meat make my Brother to offend, I will eat no Fleſh while the World ſtands, leſt I make my Brother to offend.* How vaſtly different from this tender Regard and Conſideration of the Infirmitys of others, and of how different an Original, is the inflexible Temper of ſome now-a-days, who rather than part with any thing they have once receiv'd, will endanger the Salvation of thoſe who can't ſubſcribe to it, even tho it ſhou'd prove the eternal Ruin of Thouſands *for whom* CHRIST *died?*

I have ſaid more on this Occaſion than at firſt I intended; but Mr. *Wall* had ſuppreſs'd ſo many Particulars, in his treating this Head, that 'twas needful to ſupply 'em: for they are material, and give the Caſe of our Separation quite another Aſpect. I might here make ſeveral Deductions from the Obſervations I have made, and apply 'em to the Condition of the Church in *England*; but I wave it, and only deſire you to compare what I have writ with the laſt Chapter in Mr. *Wall*.

After he has declar'd the Miſchief and Sin of Diviſions, *&c.* he addreſſes himſelf to the Anti-

* Part II. p. 383.

† 1 *Cor.* viii. 9. *Rom.* xiv. 15. 1 *Cor.* viii. 12, 13.

pædo-

pædobaptiſts: and ſince I'm oblig'd to follow him, let us briefly conſider the Point, Sir, between the Church of *England* and them. And firſt, I muſt deſire you always to remember, Mr. *Wall* argues on the Suppoſition that we are Right, and t'other ſide in the Error; and undertakes to ſhew, we have notwithſtanding no ſufficient Ground to ſeparate: an Attempt which appears too extravagant for any but a very partial Man to engage in. Wou'd you have thought it poſſible, Sir, without this Inſtance, that a Perſon of Senſe and Reading ſhou'd aſſert, 'tis unlawful to ſeparate from a Church, which ſo freely preſumes to innovate in the poſitive Inſtitutions of our SAVIOUR, and impoſe her own Alterations inſtead of 'em? And that you may ſee this is really the Caſe, and judg better how Mr. *Wall* has acquitted himſelf in his Undertaking, I'll preſent you with our Notion of the Point.

When our LORD ſent out His Diſciples to preach, and inſtituted the holy Ordinance of Baptiſm, He commanded, that all Perſons ſhou'd be firſt taught to believe in Him, and then be admitted into His Church and Covenant, by being dip'd into the Water, *in the Name of the* FATHER, *and of the* SON, *and of the* HOLY GHOST. None therefore can be true Members of the Chriſtian Church the Apoſtles were then ſent forth to gather, unleſs they are accordingly firſt taught, and afterwards regularly receiv'd, according to our LORD's Direction, by dipping 'em into the Water, and pronouncing that Sacred Form of Words He preſcrib'd.

Now, our Author ſuppoſes us in the right in all this; and yet ſays, it is not ſufficient to juſtify our Separation. The Streſs of what he urges lies in this Poſition, That the Difference is not about Fundamentals; if it were, he acknowledges, we

ought

ought to ſeparate; but the Age or Time of receiving Baptiſm cannot be ſuch. But whatever it may be in his Opinion, 'tis a Fundamental with us in the Conſtitution of a Church: and if he can think, the true Subject, and the juſt Manner of adminiſtring this Ordinance, are not of its Eſſence, but wholly indifferent, and what there is no need to be curious in; I aſſure you, we are of another Mind; and have more Reverence for our LORD's Inſtitutions, than to eſteem the due Performance of 'em ſo light a thing. 'Tis of important Conſequence, we think, to retain his Methods punctually, and not deviate in the leaſt Particular: for *'tis highly ſutable to the nature of things, to believe*, as my Lord Biſhop of *Sarum* judiciouſly obſerves, * *That our* SAVIOUR, *who has inſtituted the Sacrament, has alſo either inſtituted the Form of it, or given us ſuch Hints, as to lead us very near it.* And therefore, if it were not in reality a Fundamental, yet while we believe it is, it has the Influence of one upon our Conſciences, and we have the ſame reaſon to ſeparate.

If the Church has a greater Latitude, I appeal to you, Sir, which is moſt expedient and juſt; that ſhe ſhou'd cloſe the Rupture, by yielding to the Tenderneſs of our Conſciences, and give up what ſhe eſteems ſo very indifferent; or that we who are not ſo at liberty, ſhou'd act againſt our Conſciences, and comply with her?

But I will endeavour to prove, Sir, that what we divide for, is a Fundamental; and, without the help of a Suppoſition, that the Eſtabliſh'd Church is poſſibly in the Error. To cut this ſhort (for I won'd fain have done with this Subject) I will not give the Reaſons our Author uſes here, a particular Examination; they are ſufficiently anſwer'd

* *Expoſit. Articles*, p. 265.

by

by the foregoing Distinction, between Fundamentals of Religion, and Fundamentals in the Constitution of a true Christian Church. All he attempts to prove, is, that it is not a Fundamental Article of Faith, without which none can be sav'd; which is nothing to the purpose: for, as I shew'd above, there are other Causes which not only justify, but also necessitate a Separation from a Church. Besides, he can never evince this Negative from his own Principles. He owns Baptism it self is a Fundamental; and wou'd be understood, certainly, to mean true Christian Baptism, and not every Invention of Hereticks in antient or modern Times: He must comprehend, then, all that is essential to true Baptism, or else 'twill be imperfect; and if these suppos'd Circumstances shou'd be found to be of its Essence, it will follow from himself, that these things are Fundamentals, as being essential to what is allow'd to be so.

Baptism, I grant, is of great Necessity; and tho I dare fix no Limits to the infinite Goodness and Mercy of God, which I am confident he will give mighty Proofs of, in great Instances of Kindness towards all sincere, tho mistaken Men; however the Gospel-Rule is, according to the Doctrine of the Apostle, *to repent, and be baptiz'd, for the Remission of Sins.* We shou'd be very cautious therefore of making any Change in these things, lest we deprive our selves, thro our Presumption, of that Title to Pardon, without which there is no Salvation. But Mr. *Wall* confesses this; and, I think, 'tis as clear, that nothing can be Christian Baptism which varies from Christ's Institution. That only is Baptism which He appointed, and therefore That which differs from what He appointed, differs from Baptism; and to bring in Alterations is to change the thing,

and

and make it not the ſame, but another. This is ſelf-evident, and beyond a Queſtion.

The only Pretence, I think, that can be devis'd, is, that our LORD's Inſtitution is not ſo ſtrictly punctilious, and confin'd in the particular Circumſtances of it. But Mr. *Wall* can have no benefit from this Evaſion, becauſe, as I ſaid before, he ſuppoſes our Opinion, in this Caſe, is the true, and all he ſays is to proceed on this Suppoſition. But as Baptiſm is an Ordinance of CHRIST, it muſt of neceſſity be celebrated exactly as he appointed: and ſince to the very Being of Baptiſm, a Subject to whom it muſt be adminiſter'd is neceſſary, and a Mode of adminiſtring, without which it wou'd be only a Notion in the Brain; theſe Things, therefore, are as neceſſary as Baptiſm it ſelf. And hence it follows that the true Subjects, which are profeſs'd *Believers* only, and the true Mode, which is only *Dipping* into the Water, are neceſſary to true Baptiſm; and conſequently a Difference in theſe Points is a Difference in Fundamentals, and ſo by Mr. *Wall*'s Conceſſion a juſt Cauſe of Separation.

'Tis ſuperfluous, I think, to ſpend more time to ſhew theſe things are as proper Fundamentals as Baptiſm it ſelf, and eſſential to it, without which 'tis impoſſible it ſhou'd be Baptiſm, and wherein its very nature conſiſts. I will go on, therefore, to manifeſt how juſt and unavoidable our Separation is.

I don't know what Mr. *Wall*'s Notion of a Church may be; but if he takes it from the Thirty Nine Articles he ſubſcrib'd to at his Ordination, it will be plain: for the 19th Article ſays, *The Viſible Church of Chriſt is a Congregation of faithful Men, in which —— the Sacraments be duly adminiſter'd, according to Chriſt's Ordinance in all things, that of Neceſſity are requiſite to the ſame.*

Now

Now, if Baptism can't be duly perform'd according to CHRIST's Ordinance, (as we believe, and Mr. *Wall* supposes it true) but by dipping Believers into the Water on the Profession of their Faith; then that Church, which administers it otherwise, cannot be such a Church of CHRIST, as the Article speaks of: and if so, 'tis hard to imagine why it shou'd be unlawful to decline her Communion: For her Baptism, being wrong, becomes no Baptism, and perhaps some may carry this so far, as to question whether such a Congregation is a Visible Church. For if, as I will prove hereafter, her Baptism is not true, that is, if she have no Baptism (for *Tertullian*'s Maxim will hold good, * *They who are not duly baptiz'd, are certainly not baptiz'd at all*) tho we don't assert so much, yet to some it will, it may be, seem a little probable, that she may perhaps have no Bishops, Presbyters, *&c.* no lawful Ordinations; and (if this shou'd be allow'd) neither of the Sacraments can be duly administer'd. And then from these Suppositions, and by the Authority of the Article cited, the Clergy of the Church of *England* in general teach us to infer, that such a Congregation can be no more than a pretended Church, and that we ought to separate from such an one.

And if, as both Sides agree, Baptism is a necessary Initiation into the Christian Church; and if none are baptiz'd but Believers dip'd into the Water, (which you remember, Sir, Mr. *Wall* supposes) then nothing can be more evident, than that such as are not so baptiz'd, are not rightly initiated; and have no Title therefore to Church-Membership, but shou'd be disclaim'd.

---

* *De Baptismo, cap.* 15. *pag.* 230. Baptismum cum rite non habeant, sine dubio non habent.

Before I leave this Head, I beg leave to obſerve, how unhandſomly Mr. *Wall* acts, in ſuppoſing us right in our Opinion, and yet pronouncing our Separation unlawful; and telling us, we ought to unite with Perſons we are perſuaded are not baptiz'd. Wou'd he follow ſuch Advice himſelf, and admit any into the Church, if he believ'd they were without what he eſteems Baptiſm? It muſt be an abſurd thing, upon Mr. *Wall*'s own Principle, to receive Perſons to the Holy Euchariſt, before they have giv'n themſelves to CHRIST, and according to his Appointment, waſh'd away their Sins. This he'll think wou'd be to abuſe the Sacred Ordinance; and therefore the Church of *England* refuſes to admit any to the Communion, unleſs they are firſt not only baptiz'd, but alſo *confirm'd*; as is reſolv'd at the end of the *Order of Confirmation*.

I know Mr. *Wall* wou'd ſay, he acknowledges Baptiſm it ſelf is a Fundamental Article; and therefore it has been inſerted into ſome antient Creeds: but Modes and Circumſtances are not ſo material; and for that Reaſon, ſhou'd not be made a Pretext for Diviſions. I have ſufficiently anſwer'd this above: but I add, Mr. *Wall* can't imagine *Baptiſm in general*, (which in truth I don't know what to make of, nor how it can be adminiſter'd; for to baptize with *Baptiſm in general*, looks like a Contradiction) Mr. *Wall*, I ſay, can't imagine, that Baptiſm in general, without any regard to ſome Conditions and Circumſtances, is any Baptiſm at all. Nor can I believe, when he makes Baptiſm neceſſary, he wou'd be underſtood to mean, that ſome kind of Baptiſm or other is neceſſary; but that all Modes, Circumſtances, and the like, are wholly indifferent, and at the diſcretion of every Perſon, or Church either: for then the impious Cuſtoms of the antient Hereticks

ticks wou'd be as authentick, as the Sacred Form our LORD commanded his Disciples. But it has been universally allow'd in the Church from the beginning, and our Author seems to insist on it too, that if the Person baptiz'd has an erroneous and not a true Faith, according to the Scriptures, concerning GOD the Father, and JESUS CHRIST, and the HOLY GHOST; and if the Baptism is not administer'd in that only regular Form of Words which the Institutor prescrib'd, in the Name of the Holy and Ever-blessed TRINITY; that Baptism is *ipso facto* null and vacated: nay, St. *Cyprian*, and the Council Mr. *Wall* is so fond of at another time, make even the Orthodoxy of the Administrator necessary. From hence it appears, that he must be understood to mean *true* Baptism is necessary; which is what we say, and is therefore a sufficient Cause of our Separation; which thus, you see, our Author himself unwarily justifys.

Since he owns CHRIST's prescribing the Words of the Institution, is the only sufficient Authority to fix the Form, I can't but think we shou'd strictly follow the same Words of the Institution, as the only Rule we can be directed by in all things else relating to this Ordinance: and then all other parts of Baptism, especially the true Subject and Mode of Administration, are as necessary as the true Form of Words; and if only that Form is true which is there prescrib'd, then those only are the lawful Subjects, and that the right Mode which is there likewise specify'd: and these are, therefore, of the Foundation, as well as the Form of Words; and without either of these, the Baptism is invalid.

In short, we refuse to communicate with the Church of *England*, for the same Reason that she refuses to communicate with Persons she cannot

eſteem baptiz'd; and therefore it muſt look very ſtrange now, that any of her Members ſhou'd preſs us to act contrary to her Rules and Determinations, and join with ſuch as we conclude are without Baptiſm; and we ſhou'd ſtill be guilty of a worſe Prevarication, if they prevail'd on us to grant theirs to be a ſufficient Baptiſm, and at the ſame time keep our preſent Opinion of our own. This wou'd be acknowledging two Baptiſms, againſt the expreſs Declaration of the Apoſtle, whoſe Judgment we more willingly depend on, that there is only * *one LORD, one Faith, one Baptiſm.* And if CHRIST, as we are well aſſur'd (and our Author, you are to remember, ſuppoſes) commanded only to baptize ſuch as actually believ'd in him, according to the preaching of the Diſciples; then the Baptiſm ſo giv'n is alone the true one Baptiſm, which is certainly neceſſary; and we are oblig'd and warranted by Divine Authority to own that and no other.

This is what I judg'd needful to ſay, in order to juſtify our Separation; and demonſtrate how very frivolous Mr. *Wall*'s Reaſoning about it is. But after he has labour'd to prove our Separation Schiſmatical and Sinful, (as if he believ'd the Buſineſs was effectually done) he is pleas'd to propoſe the Terms of a Union; which are in Sum, That the Church of *England* ſhall kindly condeſcend to remain in all Particulars juſt as ſhe is, and the Antipædobaptiſts ſhall humbly ſubmit themſelves and their Conſciences to the Power and Perſecutions of the angry Party in the Church: or if they retain their Opinions concerning Baptiſm, they ſhall be indulg'd in that, provided they'll be careful to keep 'em to themſelves.

* Eph. iv. 5.

How impartial and feasible a Proposal is here! Cou'd he, think you, forbear smiling at it himself, or in earnest expect it shou'd be embrac'd? He confesses, the Church may present Antipædobaptists, and has done it, while they were reputed her Members, and were consequently in her Power: and I can tell him, however he may smooth over the Matter, they have taken the Warning, and will not put it to the Venture again; and they think themselves highly oblig'd to the Government, for the Protection it gives 'em. They will never be persuaded, on our Author's Terms especially, to rely on the Favour of the Ecclesiasticks, and strip themselves of the inviolable Security of that Toleration our most Gracious and Pious Queen has so often and so solemnly declar'd *she will maintain.*

Tho it shou'd be granted, the Church of *England* like all other Societys, has Power over her own Body; yet she has certainly none over those who withdraw from her Communion. 'Twas a home Reflection therefore on the Wisdom and Authority of the Queen and Parliament, for our Author to insinuate, that the *Act of Toleration* cannot **tie up the Church's Hands from any Proceedings against* Dissenters; who besides, by being out of her Body, are merely, on that account, out of her Power. 'Tis notorious that this does tie up the Hands of the angry Party; and we are so extremely sensible of her Majesty's Goodness in taking this Method, that we beg her Majesty graciously to give us leave still to rely solely on her Self and Parliament, under GOD, for Security; for all other we disown. As for † *the general Forbearance which is now us'd*; there are some who practise it only out of Necessity, and because

* Part II. p. 410, 411. † Part II. p. 411.

they can't help it. But ſhou'd the Toleration be once repeal'd, I fear this good Temper wou'd vaniſh like a Vapour. For Mr. *Wall* can't but remember the Proſecution and Excommunication he pronounc'd againſt Mrs. *Hall* of his Pariſh.

And, doubtleſs, he has not wholly forgot, that he preſented Mr. *Joſeph Brown* his Neighbour, for not bringing his Children to be chriſten'd. I confeſs, he ſome time afterwards ask'd that Gentleman's Pardon for what he had done; who very readily forgave him: and I ſhou'd, therefore, never have mention'd the thing, but that I have obſerv'd, Mr. *Wall* is troubled with Moderation and Forbearance but very rarely, by ſudden fits and ſtarts, which are no ſooner over, than he finds himſelf as violent and inveterate as ever: or if he be now indeed chang'd, (as I ſhou'd be heartily glad to be aſſur'd he is) he may however very well think there are ſome of that ſame Diſpoſition ſtill, who wou'd never ſuffer us to be quiet.

But had Mr. *Wall* been ſerious, he ſhou'd have made a Propoſal more fair and equal on both Sides, and proper to eſtabliſh Unity and Concord on the Principles of the firſt Churches of Chriſtians. In order to this, it wou'd be requiſite, and I think none can except againſt it, that ſome fit Perſons were choſe on both Sides, to examine the Scriptures impartially, and the Fathers of the three firſt Centurys, who follow'd their great Maſter thro Sufferings, and whoſe Writings are undoubtedly by far the beſt Commentary on the Sacred Books; and with theſe Helps to collect from the Word of God, the true Doctrine and Diſcipline of the Primitive Catholick Church: And to what ſhou'd be thus ſincerely deduc'd, every one ſhou'd reſolve to conform, without Reſerve. And I doubt not, if a Union were endeavour'd on this Expedient, it

wou'd be accompliſh'd much more eaſily than is imagin'd.

I juſt hint at this, to ſhew, Mr. *Wall* might have choſen a more reaſonable Method than he did. But 'tis not likely he ſhou'd come into it, becauſe he ſeems of an imperious Temper, and poſitive in his Opinions, which he wou'd force upon others, and not bend himſelf. And for this I appeal, among other things, to the ſeveral places where he complains of the Miſchiefs of the Magiſtrate's granting Tolerations. Why did not he embelliſh his Paragraphs with the famous Examples of *Judas*, and *Pilate*, and the High Prieſt, who as *wiſely* cut off the Ringleader of that Sect which endeavour'd to aboliſh *the Traditions of the Elders*? For theſe things will be found to be of juſt the ſame kind, if the Words of the KING in the Parable be true, *Matth.* xxv. 40. that what is done to His *Brethren* He accounts as done to Himſelf. But had not our Author forgot, that it is as indecent as it is unjuſt to talk thus? For this is to reflect on the Wiſdom and Lenity of the *Britiſh* Government, and in effect to magnify the *French* Faſhion of Dragooning People, only for endeavouring to preſerve a Conſcience void of Offence toward GOD and toward Man. But ſure our poor Proteſtant Brethren in *France* deſerve rather to be pity'd and reliev'd, than thus ſlily inſulted and condemn'd: and GOD be thank'd, they are, and will be kindly entertain'd with us, to the immortal Honour of our Gracious Queen, by whoſe pious Liberality ſo many afflicted Familys are comfortably ſubſiſted. And ſhe has moſt kindly endeavour'd to have the like Toleration ſettl'd by other Princes, her Allies, abroad, which ſhe has confirm'd at home. So extenſive is her Goodneſs! But it touches me very cloſe, to ſee a Man,

whose Function is to serve at the Altar, and minister in the Holy Things of the Gospel, of a Complexion so repugnant to the Meekness, Love, and charitable Forbearance which CHRIST so often, so strictly enjoin'd; and I'm concern'd that some of the Leaders of the Church do not know *what manner of Spirit they are of.*

Now, to conclude: I hope I have made out, Sir, what I took upon me to prove, which was, That Mr. *Wall* is not a Writer to repose a full Confidence in; but has committed several Mistakes, and must be read warily, and with Suspicion.

I am, *&c.*

LETTER

LETTER III.

Another Instance of Mr. Wall's *Unfairness. The Dispute between the* English *Pædobaptists and us cast under two Heads. It's strange, Things so clear shou'd be capable of so much Dispute. So far as the Scriptures are clear, our Practice is allow'd to be exactly agreeable therewith. Therefore if we err, we are, however, on the safer side.* GOD *has reveal'd His Will with sufficient Clearness, in all material Points. And He has not left it doubtful in what Manner, or to what Subjects Baptism shou'd be administer'd. A trifling Remark of Mr.* Wall's *noted. 'Tis better not to pretend to baptize Persons, than not to do it as* CHRIST *requires it shou'd be done. The Greek Word for* baptize *always signifys to dip only into any manner of thing. So* Lycophron. *And* Sophocles. *But more commonly, 'tis us'd for dipping into Liquids. So* Homer. *Metaphors include and borrow their Beautys from the Thing from whence they are taken.* Pindar *and his Scholiast.* Euripides *and his Scholiasts.* Aristophanes *in many places. The Words in Dispute frequently apply'd to the Dyers Art: and they colour things by dipping 'em. Several Passages wherein the Word alludes to the Art of Dying, consider'd. The improper Use of Words in metaphorical Passages, can't be suppos'd to alter their Signification. Figurative Forms of Speech, are only abbreviated Similes. 'Tis no Objection to say, if Words are always literally understood, Authors will be made to speak Nonsense. Figurative Sentences not literally true, as they stand; but being defective, the Sense*

must

muſt be ſupply'd. We ſhou'd diſtinguiſh between the Senſe of a Phraſe, as it includes ſome Words not expreſs'd; and the Senſe of the particular Words ſingly conſider'd, juſt as they ſtand. Words have no more than one Signification. Words are always to be taken in their literal Senſe. The Uſe of theſe Obſervations in the preſent Diſpute. More Inſtances from Ariſtophanes. πλύνω *is to waſh by dipping. More Inſtances from* Ariſtotle. *From* Heraclides Ponticus. *From* Herodotus Halicarnaſſeus. *From* Theocritus. *From* Moſchus. *From* Aratus. *From* Callimachus. *From* Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus. *From* Strabo. *From* Plutarch. *From* Lucian. *From the Emperor* Marcus Antoninus. *The metaphorical Uſe of the Word in Diſpute, when apply'd to the Mind, conſider'd and explain'd. Other Inſtances from* Pollux. *From* Themiſtius. *That Lexicographers and Criticks render the Word by* Lavo, *is no Argument they ever underſtood it to mean leſs than to* dip.

SIR,

BY Mr. *Wall*'s Character, which I have given you at large in my former, you may judg of his Temper and Deſign: but there is one remarkable Inſtance of his Diſingenuity, not yet taken notice of, which muſt by no means be omitted: I mean, his unfair Pretences, and falſe Aſſertions, concerning the Word βαπτίζω. I deſign'd to have mention'd this before, but conſidering it is a Branch of our main Diſpute, and requires a particular Examination, I defer'd it, and will enter on it now.

As the Controverſy ſtands between us and the *Engliſh* Pædobaptiſts, it may be caſt under two Heads: One relating to the Mode of Baptiſm; whether it is to be adminiſter'd only by *Dipping:* and the other (which muſt be handl'd more fully)

is,

is, who are the true Subjects of it, whether Adult Persons alone, or Infants also.

One wou'd wonder a thing of this nature shou'd be capable of so much Dispute: for if it is not instituted, it ought not to be practis'd; and if it be instituted, it shou'd seem impossible for any not to see it. But if there is indeed reasonable ground for these Doubts, and a matter of such Importance is involv'd in such inextricable Difficultys, as some pretend; I think it reflects highly on the Legislator's Conduct, who has ordain'd Laws, on the performance of which our Eternal Salvation depends, and yet left the Sense and Construction of 'em so perplex'd and hard to be known. But we are well assur'd it is not so, and are more concern'd for the Honour and Goodness of God, than to imagine, with our Author and his Party, that our blessed SAVIOUR has not plainly enough told us what he expects from us: no, we are confident he has declar'd his Will to us, in this and all other Articles of like Consequence, with all necessary Evidence; and what he has not taught us with a sufficient Clearness, he never design'd for the Object of Obedience.

Our Enemys allow, that as far as the Scriptures are clear in the present Case, our Practice exactly agrees with 'em; and they must confess too their own is very different from what the Text declares to have been done in the antient times. Thus they allow, nothing is more clearly set down in Holy Writ, than that those who believ'd were to be, and actually were baptiz'd, by being immers'd or dip'd into the Water on the Profession of their Faith: and that our Practice thus far punctually answers, is beyond Contradiction; whence it follows, that the Practice of the Pædobaptists, where it differs from ours, is not conformable to something deliver'd in Scripture: and therefore

on

on the whole, we do what the Scriptures expreſly teach, while they, at beſt, do but what is very obſcurely, and perhaps not at all taught in 'em. That the Apoſtles and the Primitive Church did dip when they baptiz'd, is plain; but that they us'd Sprinkling or Affuſion likewiſe, is not: And that they baptiz'd Adult Perſons who declar'd their Faith in our REDEEMER, is clear; but that ever any Infant was baptiz'd by 'em, is again confeſs'd on all hands not to be ſo evident.

As far as we go, then, we have the Scriptures undoubtedly juſtifying us; but where they leave us, we ſtop, not daring to venture beyond their Direction, as thinking it ſafer to walk by their Light, than to wander in unknown Paths. If this be a Fault (as I can't tell how to think it one) 'tis a Fault however on the ſafer hand: for what can poor fallible Mankind do better, than where two things ſeem to claſh, to follow that which is clear, rather than uncertain Conjectures, or even the faireſt Probabilitys? which (to ſuppoſe more than is true) is the moſt that can be urg'd for our Adverſarys.

Theſe Conſiderations alone, if nothing elſe cou'd be added, wou'd render our Caſe ſecure, and far the more eligible. But we have infinitely more to ſay in our behalf: For GOD has truly reveal'd his Will with Clearneſs, and not couch'd it in ambiguous Terms and myſterious Forms of Speech, like the Oracles of the Heathens; he deſign'd to be obey'd, and has ſpoke ſo as to be underſtood: And we can't but think, to deduce a Senſe from the Words which was not intended, is very difficult, and requires Artifice and Violence; whereas the genuine meaning wants no ſuch Labour, but is natural and eaſy: And whatever Senſe, therefore, appears conſtrain'd, ought, at leaſt, to be ſuſpected as foreign from the true.

For

For these as well as other Reasons, Sir, which I shall lay before you in the Prosecution of this Discourse, we cannot believe it is so doubtful in Scripture, as many pretend, whether Dipping only be Baptism, and whether Believers alone may lawfully be baptiz'd. These are the chief Questions in Debate between the Pædobaptists and us, which, if they can be amicably determin'd, will go far towards putting an end to the Separation. But Mr. *Wall*'s Management is not likely to have so good Success: the Point must be treated with more Temper and Modesty, as well as stronger Argument, if it be really intended to gain us; but neither his Arguments, nor any other, which yet have been produc'd, will prove what they are brought for, as I will now endeavour to shew: and I'll begin with the words βαπτίζω and βάπτω, for they are synonymous, as Mr. *Wall* himself likewise seems to allow; and therefore I shall promiscuously cite the Instances wherein one or the other word occurs.

Our Author, to make us look very inflexible and cruel, begins what he says upon this Head, with this frightful Remark, *That we are possess'd with an Opinion of the absolute Necessity of dipping the baptiz'd Person over Head and Ears into the Water, so far,* as to *let* any Man, tho ever so sick, *die unbaptiz'd, rather than baptize him by Affusion,* &c. Which you are to imagine is a great piece of Barbarity, because in so doing 'tis suppos'd we chuse to expose a Person to the hazard of being damn'd, rather than recede from our fix'd Method. But Mr. *Wall* might have spar'd the Reflection, since himself allows the Desire of Baptism is sufficient, where Baptism it self can't be had; so that the Consequence of our refusing to administer that Ordinance in such a manner, is not so terrible as he insinuates.

Besides,

Beſides, we think it better to do thus, than to delude dying Men with falſe Performances, and let 'em go out of the World, as Pædobaptiſts do, without real Baptiſm, or even a Deſire of it, which doubtleſs is much worſe than what we are charg'd with. But to make a Shew of Tenderneſs and Compaſſion, ſuch generous Men as our Author and his Party have found out an Expedient, rather than ſuffer Perſons to go into Eternity, without being firſt baptiz'd for the Remiſſion of their Sins, to baptize, *i. e.* dip 'em by Affuſion or Sprinkling.

But notwithſtanding the Inventions which ingenious Men may be fond of, I am honeſtly for ſitting down with the Simplicity of the firſt Chriſtians, and keeping to the good old way: the fine Improvements introduc'd ſince are too curious and ſubtle for me to comprehend 'em; and I can't ſee but * *the word* Baptize *neceſſarily includes Dipping in its Signification, and that Chriſt by commanding to baptize, has commanded to dip only.* Mr. *Wall* indeed tells me this *is plainly a Miſtake*; but I have no great Opinion of his Judgment, and won't take his Word: on the contrary, I hope to make it appear plainly to be an unavoidable Truth, and no Miſtake. In order to this, I muſt deſire you, Sir, to conſider how the word is us'd among the *Greeks*, by the Particulars which follow.

I have carefully obſerv'd it a conſiderable time, as it occur'd in reading, and aſſure you I never found it once us'd to ſignify *to pour or ſprinkle*, or any thing leſs than Dipping; and I may challenge any Man to ſhew a ſingle Inſtance of it, except in ſome Eccleſiaſtical Writers of the latter corrupt times, who retaining the words of the Inſtitution, and altering the thing, do, in this

* Par. II. p. 219.

Caſe

Case indeed, but no other, extend the word into a wider Sense: But profane Authors, who lay under no such biass, have made no such Alteration. 'Tis evident from them, the primary meaning is simply *to dip*, not only into Water, but any Matter.

Thus *Lycophron*, representing *Cassandra* prophesying how *Orestes* shou'd punish *Clytemnestra* for her Parricide, says *, *The Child, discovering his Father's Murder, shall, with his own Hand* (βάψει) *thrust his Sword into the Viper's Body*; or, as the great *Scaliger* has more literally translated it, *merget, shall plunge his Sword into the Viper's Bowels*, that is, run her thro. It can't be pretended that this is a figurative Expression, for the Sense of the word plainly appears to be natural and direct, and to contain no Metaphor in it.

Exactly the same Phrase is that of *Sophocles* †, (ἔβαψας) *Thou hast dip'd or thrust thy Sword into the* Grecian *Army*; and *Plonger l' Epee*, in this very Sense, is common enough in the *French* Tongue. Mr. *Dryden* likewise expresses the Poet's Sense thus, in the 7th *Eneid*, p. 638.

Thus having said, her smouldring Torch, impress'd
With her full Force, she plung'd into his Breast.

I might multiply Examples to this purpose, but βαπτίζω is more commonly us'd to signify *to dip* into Liquids; not from any necessity in the word, but because Liquids are most proper for this Action, which also is mostly perform'd in 'em. 'Twou'd be endless to collect all the Instances of this kind in Authors, who frequently use the word

* Cassandr. v. 1121. Εἰς σπλάγχν' ἐχίδνης ἀυτόχειρ βάψει ξίφος.

† Ajace, v. 95. Ἔβαψας ἔγχος ὦ πρὸς ἀργείων στρατῷ.

in

in this Senſe, but never once to ſignify *Waſhing* in general, or *Sprinkling*. Nay, I don't remember one Paſſage, where all other Senſes are not neceſſarily excluded beſides *Dipping*, as may be ſeen from theſe Quotations.

Homer (for we'll begin with him as the moſt antient, and trace it down to the latter Period of the *Grecian* Empire) deſcribing *Ulyſſes* with his Companions putting out *Polyphemus*'s Eye with a burning Brand, and what abundance of Blood iſſu'd out, and quench'd the Brand with a loud hiſſing, illuſtrates it with this Simile, * *As when a Smith to harden a Hatchet or maſſy Pole-ax* (βάπτει) *dips 'em in cold Water.* If any one can doubt what the word imports here, any Blackſmith's Boy will ſet him right by an ocular Demonſtration. And in his *Batrachomyomachia* (if he be the Author of that excellent ludicrous Poem, and not *Pigres*, Brother to *Artemeſia*, as *Plutarch* is inclin'd to believe) when one of the Champions is ſlain on the Bank of a Lake, he ſays, ‖ *He breathleſs fell, and the Lake was ting'd* (ἐβάπτετο) *with Blood.*

I the rather mention this, becauſe if any Place is brought to prove βάπτω and βαπτίζω do not always ſignify to dip, I fancy this will be one. But, whatever ſome may do, you underſtand the nature of Languages too well, Sir, to make it an Exception; and all who have made any Obſervations of the Uſe of Words in their Mother-Tongue, muſt be ſenſible it is not againſt what I aſſert, but for it. The Phraſe, we muſt conſider, is borrow'd from the Dyers, who colour things by dipping them in their Dye: and to this the Poet

* Ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἀνὴρ χαλκεὺς πέλεκυν μέγαν ἠὲ σκέπαρνον
Εἰν ὕδατι ψυχρῷ βάπτῃ, &c. Odyſſ. 1. v. 392.

‖ V. 218. Κάπτεσι δ', ἐκ ἀνέτευσεν ἐβάπτετο δ' αἵματι λίμνη.

plainly alludes; not that the Lake was actually dip'd in Blood, but ſo deeply ſtain'd, that to heighten our Idea, he expreſſes it, with the uſual liberty of Poets, by a Word which ſignifys more than what is ſtrictly true, which is the nature of all *Hyperboles.* Thus the literal Senſe is, *The Lake was dip'd in Blood*; but the Figure only means, it was colour'd as highly as any thing that's dip'd in Blood.

I am apt to think ὥσπερ, ὡσανὲι, *&c.* are to be underſtood here to qualify the ſeeming Extravagance of the Expreſſion; as alſo in all *Hyperboles*, which I take to be ſo many *Ellyptical* Phraſes in which a Word is wanting: now if we ſuppoſe the Poet, as 'tis natural enough, ſuppreſſes ſome Particle, and we ſupply it by inſerting ὥσπερ, the Senſe will run very clear thus, *The Lake was as it had been dip'd in Blood.* Whether you'll allow this Criticiſm or not, you can't but ſay, nothing cou'd render the Paſſage more expreſſive, or the Senſe more natural and eaſy.

Every Metaphor, you'll remember, Sir, includes the Thing from whence 'tis borrow'd, receives its whole Force from it, and muſt have its Senſe determin'd by it. To give an Inſtance from the fine Language of *Thucydides: Pericles*, in an Oration there, reminds the murmuring *Athenians*, that they ought to labour to ſupport the Dignity of the Commonwealth, by maintaining the Independent Power and Command they were all ſo proud of, * *and either not fly from Dangers, or not purſue after Honours.* In the Word φεύγειν, *to fly*; and διώκειν, *to purſue*; is an Alluſion to the Fortune of a Battel, where one

* Lib. 2. c. 63. Τῆς τε πόλεως ὑμᾶς εἰκὸς τῷ τιμωμένῳ ἀπὸ ἄρχειν (ὥσπερ ἅπαντες ἀγάλλεσθε) βοηθεῖν, καὶ μὴ φεύγειν τοὺς πόνους, μηδὲ τὰς τιμὰς διώκειν.

Side is worſted and flys, and the other purſues 'em: and thus underſtood, the Words have a mighty Emphaſis in 'em; but otherwiſe, no Meaning at all, but are Soloeciſms both in Language and Senſe too.

To ſpeak but of one: διώκειν ſignifys only to purſue, as a Conqueror does a flying Enemy; and when transfer'd to another Caſe, it continues to ſignify the ſame thing, in ſome reſpect or other: * 'tis a ſhorter kind of Simile, where ſeveral things are imply'd which are not expreſs'd; at leaſt the Beauty of it lies in comparing the proper Import of the Word, with what it is us'd to ſignify by the Figure. Thus the Eagerneſs and Vigour with which a victorious purſues a routed Army, is apply'd to that Paſſion for Glory, which was ſo conſpicuous in the *Athenians*. And to bring it cloſer to our purpoſe: The Effect being as it were the ſame, *Homer*, by putting the Cauſe for the Effect, deſcribes the Lake's being thorowly ſtain'd by a Word, which ſignifys a Dyer's dipping a thing to colour it.

From all this it appears, that the Senſe of ἐάπλω, even in this place, is to *dip*, and nothing elſe. I have inſiſted the larger on it here, becauſe I don't know whether I ſhall care to take the ſame pains with all other metaphorical Paſſages. If you find any which ſeem material, and I ſhou'd let 'em go unobſerv'd, examine 'em by what is here advanc'd, and I am perſuaded the Difficultys will preſently vaniſh: If they don't, pray acquaint me with 'em, and I will conſider 'em with all Impartiality and Attention. But to proceed.

The next Author I ſhall mention, is *Pindar*; who upon his Enemys baſely aſperſing him, de-

* Ariſtot. Poetic. c. 22. Τὸ γὰρ ἐυ μεταφερειν, τὸ ὅμοιον θεωρεῖν ἐστι.

ſcribes his Contempt of their impotent Malice by this Simile, which as literally as I can render it in *Engliſh*, is thus: * *As when a Net is caſt into the Sea, the Cork ſwims above; ſo,* ἀβάπτιστος, *am not I ſunk*, viz. in their Reproaches. And by the way, this place confirms what I a little before advanc'd, that Figures are but a ſhort imperfect Simile; for ἀβάπτιστος here is full as metaphorical as that which I cited from *Homer*: (and *Horace* ſeems to imitate this of *Pindar*, Lib. 1. Epiſt. 2.

——— *Aſpera multa*
Pertulit, adverſis Rerum immerſabilis Undis.)

Τὸ φελλος, the thing whence the Simile is taken, being added, the Senſe is very clear; and the Word, 'tis evident, intends, that the Cork, while the Net ſinks down into the Sea, cannot it ſelf be forc'd down, but will float above. This is ſo plain, that I think it neither wants nor can have an Explanation: but the Words of the antient *Greek* Scholiaſt on the place, tending ſo much to confirm my Aſſertion, I will tranſcribe 'em: *For like the Cork of a Net in the Sea,* I ſwim, and (ὐ βαπτίζομαι) *am not ſunk. As the Cork, tho loaded with the Tackle, does not ſink,* ὐ λύνει; *ſo I alſo am immerſible,* ἀβάπτιστος, *like it, and not to be overwhelm'd. They rail at me, indeed,* ſays he: *but as when the Net is caſt, and ſunk under Water, the Cork remains* ἀβάπτιστος, *immerſible, and ſwims on the Surface on the Sea, being of a nature which* ἀβάπτιστος *cannot ſink; in like manner cannot I* ἀβάπτιστος, *ſink or be overwhelm'd in the Calumnys*

* Pyth. 2. v. 139. Ἄτε γὰρ εἰναλίου πόνου ὁ
χοίσας ἔσθ' ὑπὲρ ἁλὸς ἕτερος ἀεὶ
πλώς ὁς εἰμι. φελλὸς ὡς
ὕσσῳ ἔχῃ ἄλμας.

and Detractions of others; for I'm of another nature, and as the Cork is in a Fiſhing-Net.

Thus the Scholiaſt, you ſee, Sir, by his uſe of the Word, leaves not the leaſt room to imagine it ever ſignifys to *ſprinkle* or *pour*, or any thing but to *dip*, or *put under*, or *into*. And 'tis very remarkable, that he ſeems to have thought no Word more proper than this to expreſs what you ſee plainly is his Senſe: but as often as he repeats the ſame thing, which he does *ad nauſeam*, tho it had been needful to vary the Word, and avoid that unpleaſantneſs of the Repetition, he changes it but once, and then he has Λύνει inſtead of it, which you know, Sir, ſignifys *to ſink*, tho not ſo emphatically as βαπτίζω, witneſs *Pollux in Onomaſt.*

In the next place, give me leave to cite *Euripides*. The *Grecians* had ſacrific'd *Polyxena* to the Ghoſt of *Achilles*; and after the Solemnity, they permitted *Hecuba* to bury her Daughter's Body: in order to which, according to the known Cuſtom of her Country on ſuch Occaſions, ſhe deſigns firſt to waſh and purify the Corps: for which purpoſe, ſhe calls out to her Servant, * *Go, take the Water-Pot, my good old Maid, and* βάψασ' *dip it in the Sea, and bring it hither*, &c. for the Sea-Waters were thought naturally more cleanſing than others, as † *Didymus* and ‖ *Euſtathius* tell us.

Βάπτειν ποντίας ἅλός, the Phraſe the Poet puts into *Hecuba*'s Mouth on this occaſion, can have no

---

* Hecub. Act. 3. v. 609. tot. Dram. Σὺ δ' ὦ λαβοῦσα τεῦχος, ἀρχαία λάτει, Βάψασ', ἔνεγκε δεῦρο πωλίας ἁλός.

† Didym. ad Iliad. α. v. 314. Φύσει δὲ τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς θαλάσσης καθαρτικόν ἐστιν.

‖ Euſtath. ibid. p. 108. Ἡ πάντως διὰ τὸ φύσει ῥυπτικὴν εἶναι τὸ τῆς θαλάσσης ὕδωρ.

Am-

Ambiguity in it; and the Scholiast renders it exceeding plain by the parallel Phrases he mentions: thus τὸ ἔφαγε τὸν ἄρτον, is *to eat Bread*, and τὸ ἔπιε τὸν οἶνον, *to drink Wine:* and so βάπτειν πυτίας ἅλω is, as we commonly say in *English*, *to dip a Pail of Water.* But if it will be more Satisfaction to you, I'll bring the decisive Determination of a *Grecian* Critick, whom *Arsenius* Archbishop of *Monembasia*, thought fit to be admitted, among other great ones, into his Collection of Scholiasts upon *Euripides.* One of 'em says expresly on this place, * Βάπτειν *signifys to let down or put any thing into Water, or any other Liquid.* He explains it by the very same Word which is us'd by St. *Luke*, *Acts* ix. 25. and in his Gospel, *Chap.* v. *Ver.* 4, 5. to express letting the Net down into the Sea: and so also by St. *Mark*, Chap. ii. Ver. 4. Accordingly, either the same Critick, therefore, or some other from whom *Arsenius* takes it, observes a little before, that the † *Water was to be drawn out of the inmost parts of the Sea*; having an Eye, undoubtedly, to the Meaning of the Word, which must be to *dip*, or the Remark is wholly groundless: for in any other Sense there can be no occasion, nor indeed any room for it.

Aristophanes uses the Word several times: I have mark'd down fourteen, which I believe are all the places where it occurs; and they none of 'em in the least favour Mr. *Wall*'s Pretences, but on the contrary, make very strongly for the Opinion I advance. The *Grecians* very frequently apply the Word, in all its various Forms, to the Dyers Art; sometimes perhaps not very properly, but always so as to imply and refer only to its true natural Signification, *to dip.*

---

* Βάπτειν ἐστὶ τὸ χαλᾶν τι εἰς ὕδωρ, ἢ εἰς ἕτερόν τι ὑγρόν.
† ὕδωρ ἁλυόντι, ἀπὸ τῶν ἐνδοτάτω μέρων τῆς θαλάσσης.

Thus, * *Dreſs not with coſtly Clothes*, ſays this Poet, *which* (βαπτῶν) *are dy'd or dip'd in the richeſt Colours.* And ſo again in his Comedy, entitl'd, † *Peace:* and in his ‖ *Lyſiſtrata. Ariſtotle* likewiſe uſes it ſo, when he ſays, ** *All theſe things, by means of Heat and Moiſture, enter the Pores of ſuch things as are dip'd* (βαπτομένων) *into 'em, which retain the Colour they have taken, when the Moiſture is dry'd away.* And at the end of the ſame Chapter; †† *The colour of things dip'd or dy'd,* (βαπτομένων) *is chang'd by the foreſaid Cauſes.* And *Plutarch* ſpeaking of *Lycurgus*'s Care to ſecure the Commonwealth from all thoſe Arts which introduce or encourage Luxury; among the reſt, ſays, ‖‖ He forbid to practiſe the *Art of Dying*, (βαφικὴ) or dipping into Colours, becauſe it tended to effeminate the Mind, by engaging and *flattering the Senſes.*

But there is a great plenty of Examples of this kind (*a*), which 'tis needleſs to mention: and I believe there is no occaſion to go about to perſuade you, that Workmen *dye* by dipping; and for that reaſon, have appropriated the Word to their buſineſs. However, leſt there be any Suſpicion in you, that it might perhaps be perform'd in ſome other manner; I'll only deſire you

---

* Plut. Act. 2. Scen. 5. Οὐδ' ἱματίων βαπτῶν δαπάναις κοσμῆσαι ποικιλομόρφων.

† *Pag.* 672, 674. ‖ *Pag.* 828.

** De Coloribus, cap. 4. Ἀεὶ γὰρ ἀπὸ πάντων αὐτῶν, ἅμα τοῦ τε ὑγροῦ καὶ τοῦ θερμοῦ τῶν χρωμάτων ξυνεισιόντων εἰς τὰς τῶν βαπτομένων πόρους, ὅταν ἀποξηρανθῇ, τὰς ἀπ' ἐκείνων χρόας ἀπολαμβάνει.

†† Τῶν δὲ βαπτομένων τὰ χρώματα, ἀλλοιοῦται διὰ τὰς εἰρημένας αἰτίας.

‖‖ Apoph. Lacon. p. 405. Τὴν δὲ βαφικὴν, ὡς κολακείαν ἀπεδοκίμασεν.

(*a*) *Herodot. Polymn. p.* 258. Cteſ. Indicis paſſim, *&c.*

wou'd

wou'd pleaſe to conſider, *dipping* is the only probable and convenient way; and in every reſpect, perfectly agreeable to the Nature of the Thing, as well as to that Senſe of the Word, which is very conſiderable. We ſee, 'tis the only way with us; and, which carrys the Parallel ſtill farther between the antient *Greeks* and Us, as they us'd βάπτω, we uſe the Word *Dip*, both among the Workmen in the Shop, and in ordinary Converſation; for what's more common, than to talk of having ſuch or ſuch a Thing *dip'd*, meaning in the Dyers *Copper*, or in ſome Colours? So Mr. *Milton* has us'd it, in his beautiful Deſcription of the Angel *Raphael*, Paradiſe Loſt, *B.* 5.

—— *The middle Pair*, i. e. of his Wings,
Girt like a Starry Zone his Waſte, and round
Skirted his Loins and Thighs with downy Gold,
And Colours dip'd in Heav'n.

Beſides, 'tis obſervable, that the *Grecians* made a difference between *Dye* and other colouring Matter: Thus *Plutarch* * diſtinguiſhes between χρώματα and βάμματα; and *Pollux* † does the ſame; βάμματα ſignifying only that ſort of Colouring into which any thing is dip'd, according to the Senſe of the Word, as I ſee *Stephens* ‖ alſo has remark'd. And there is a Paſſage in *Seneca* ** very clear to this Purpoſe: *Intereſt, quam diu macerata ſit, craſſius Medicamentum an aquatius traxerit, ſæpius merſa ſit & excocta, an ſemel tincta. There is a difference alſo, how long it lies infus'd; whether the Dye be thick and groſs, or wateriſh and faint; and*

* De diſcernend. Amic. & Adulat. *p.* 94. med.
† Onomaſt. *lib.* 7. *c.* 23.
‖ Ad Voc. χρῶμα.
** Quæſt. Natural. *lib.* 1. *c.* 3. *p.* 484.

whether it be dip'd very often and boil'd thoroughly, or only once tinctur'd. And * *Phavorinus* and † *Pollux* uſe καταβάπτων, which on all hands is allow'd moſt emphatically to ſignify *dipping*, *plunging*, *immerſing*, as a ſynonymous Word for βάπτων and χρωνυὺς, in *Engliſh* a *Dyer*.

This makes it neceſſary to ſuppoſe they *dy'd* by *dipping*; as well as another word us'd among 'em in theſe Caſes, *viz.* ἕψειν *to boil*: ‖ *They boil it in Kettles*, ſays *Ariſtotle*; —— *and when the Flowers are boil'd long enough together, at length all becomes of a purple Colour.* And *Heſychius* and *Pollux* interpret the ſame word of *Dying*. Now if they us'd to *boil* the Things they *dy'd*, undoubtedly they firſt *dip'd* or *put 'em* into the Liquor. But enough of this.

There are other Paſſages, ſomewhat a-kin to theſe, which ſeem however to leave a little more room for the Objections of our Adverſarys; where, tho indeed the Word is us'd, it appears by other Circumſtances, that the Writer cou'd not mean *dip* by it. We may ſee Inſtances of this in *Ariſtophanes*; as where he ſays *Magnes*, an old Comick of *Athens*, us'd the ** *Lydian Muſick*, *ſhav'd the Face, and ſmear'd it over* (βαπτόμυρος) *with tawny Waſhes*. He ſpeaks of the homely Entertainments of the antient Theatre, where the Actors daub'd themſelves with Lees of Wine, and any odd Colours, before *Eſchylus* reform'd it, and introduc'd the uſe of Maſques and Vizors. *Ariſtophanes* expreſſes this by βαπτόμυρος βαλανχείοις; not that

* *Pag.* 358.

† Onomaſtic. *lib.* 7. *c.* 22.

‖ De Coloribus, *c.* 5. Ἕψουσιν ἐν ταῖς χύτραις —— καὶ τότε τελέως ἅπαντα γίνεται πορφυροειδῆ ὅταν ἀνθέων ἱκανῶς συνεψηθέντων.

** Ἱππεῖς, Act 1. Scen. 3. *p.* 300. Καὶ λυδίζων, καὶ ψιμύθιον, καὶ βαπτόμυρος βαλανχείοις.

he

he ſuppoſes they dip'd their Faces into the Colour, but rather ſmear'd the Colour on their Faces. He has alſo * βάπτω ὄρνις for *a colour'd Bird*, not implying it was dy'd by Art, but only denoting its natural Colour by that Epithet. In like manner, *Ariſtotle* ſays, † *If 'tis preſs'd, it dyes* (βάπτει) *and colours the Hand*; and *Plutarch*, ‖ *That which is black of it ſelf, is not* (βαπτὸν) *dy'd* or *colour'd by Art, but by Nature*, &c.

But thoſe Perſons who wou'd depend upon theſe Paſſages to prove, that βάπτω ſignifys ſomething elſe beſides *dipping*, muſt conſider, there is a manifeſt Alluſion in theſe and all ſuch, to the Art of *Dying*. And if the Word is borrow'd from thence, as none can be hardy enough to deny, they muſt allow it is us'd there improperly, and metaphorically; and that its true primitive Meaning only is ſtill refer'd to, and imply'd. What I ſaid above upon the ſecond Citation from *Homer*, which is exactly the ſame Phraſe with theſe, may therefore equally ſerve to explain all ſuch Paſſages: and I deſire you wou'd carry it along with you, Sir, in reading, to ſave me the trouble of repeating it.

If in all alluſive metaphorical Expreſſions, we ſuppoſe the Senſe of Words to be alter'd, there will be the greateſt Confuſion in Languages imaginable, and much beyond that of *Babel*. All Words had a determinate Signification there, in themſelves; and the People were miraculouſly render'd incapable of underſtanding one another, not by the various Significations of the ſame Word, but, as 'tis generally believ'd, by new ones being

* Ορνιθ. p. 526.

† Hiſt. Animal. *lib.* 5. *cap.* 15. *p.* 645. Θλιβόμενον δὲ, βάπτει καὶ ἀνθίζει τὴν χεῖρα.

‖ Quæſt. Rom. 26. p. 482, 483. Τὸ δὲ αὐτόχρων μέλαν, οὐκ ἐκ τέχνης ἀλλὰ φύσει βαπτὸν ἐστι, &c.

inſtantly

inſtantly put into the Mouths of thoſe, who were made at the ſame time as ſuddenly to forget the old ones they had been always us'd to.

We are by no means therefore to imagine Words are of ſo vagrant and uncertain a Meaning: the improper uſe of 'em does not change their Senſe; otherwiſe there cou'd be no improper uſe, no Figures of Speech, and no Alluſions: for the Senſe, not the Letters of a Word, is the Foundation of the Alluſion; and if the natural Senſe is chang'd, and another ſubſtituted, Words are us'd alike properly in all Caſes, and only for what they literally ſignify: and ſo loſing in ſuch Caſes their former Signification, all Metaphors, Alluſions, Hyperboles, *&c.* are loſt too. But the Alluſion being ſo plain in the Caſe before us, I inſiſt upon it, that the Word literally ſignifys only to *dip*, or *put into*, &c. and, as I noted before, ωσπερ, or ſome ſuch Particle, is to be underſtood, to qualify the ſeeming Extravagance of the Expreſſion, which is a ſort of abbreviated Simile, where a great part is ſuppreſs'd and conceal'd; and only ſo much expreſs'd as will hint the reſt to the Mind, and give it occaſion to ſupply it. This Obſervation will, without much Difficulty, be admitted by all who have any Knowledg in, and made any Obſervations about, the nature and uſe of Languages; and I ſhall elſewhere have occaſion to cite ſome Words from *Plato*, which conſiderably illuſtrate, or rather enforce it.

'Tis very pertinent to this Purpoſe, what the Scholiaſt ſays on a Paſſage of *Ariſtophanes* *, which is literally thus; *Leſt I dip you* (βάπτω) *into a Sardinian*, i. e. a Scarlet, *Dye*. The Senſe of it, ſays

* Ἀχαρν. Act. 1. Scen. 3. Ἵνα μή σε βάπτω βαμμα Σαρδιανικόν.

the

the Scholiast, is, * *If you don't tell me the Truth, I'll beat you till I make you all red with Blood.* That is, (to fill up the Sense of the Poet from his Scholiast) I'll beat you till you are besmear'd over with Blood, and as red as if I had dip'd you in Scarlet. But the Poet, to carry off something of the Littleness, which in a Thought so low and familiar wou'd otherwise too much have shewn it self, uses a more rais'd and vigorous Expression here, instead of this long Sentence, which wou'd have been too tedious and flat.

'Tis no Objection to say, that if the Word in such places signifys literally nothing but to *dip*, *&c.* the Sense, if it must be suppos'd there can be any, will be absurd, as well as most grosly false. For indeed, what can be more ridiculous, than for a Man seriously to talk of dipping a Lake or River, *&c.* in Blood? or of a Lady's dipping her Face in Vermilion, when she adorns it with artificial Colour? which, on the contrary, 'tis known must be more artfully laid on. I readily grant, the Words, as they stand in the Passages refer'd to, are not literally true; and if it cou'd be imagin'd the Authors intended they shou'd be literally understood, they wou'd appear very ridiculous, and deserve the utmost Contempt: But 'tis plain, their Design is very different; and their manner of expressing themselves is very proper to their Design, and agreeable enough to the Nature of Languages, and especially of that they wrote in. And it can be no very strange thing to meet with Words in Books, as well as in common Conversation, us'd in a Sense not literally true; and all Ironys and Hyperboles, and, in general, all the Tropes and Figures of

† Βέλεται ἐν δηλῶν ὅτι εἰ μὴ εἰποῖς ταληθὲς, μαστίζων σε ἐρυθρὸν ποιήσω πᾶς ἅιμασι.

Speech

Speech which Rhetorick teaches, are Inſtances of it: and this you, to be ſure, Sir, ſo perfectly underſtand, that I need not enlarge. But to illuſtrate it by one plain Example in our own Tongue, be pleas'd only to obſerve, 'tis common with us to ſay, ſuch a Fact or Report *ſtains a Man's Reputation.* Nevertheleſs, this is not true in the Letter, nor wou'd we be underſtood as if it were, Reputation not being capable of a literal Stain; we only mean to ſignify by this Ellyptical Simile, (the word *Stain* giving occaſion to ſupply what is ſuppreſs'd) that as Stains on Linen, or any thing white, take from its Beauty and Clearneſs; ſo ill Reports, *&c.* leſſen and impair the Purity of a Man's Reputation, and are to it what Stains are to clean Linen. And thus, notwithſtanding this Phraſe be not true in the *Letter*, yet the word *Stain* does not in the leaſt change, but retain its Signification; and the Senſe of the Phraſe is to be ſupply'd, as the word *Stain* directs, by filling up the Similitude, as I have juſt now done, or elſe in that ſhorter manner I before ſhew'd, when I ſpoke of *Homer*, by inſerting *as it were*; and then it will run thus: *This or the other thing does as it were ſtain a Man's Reputation.*

This is readily brought home to the Caſe in hand. I proceed therefore to add farther, That it may not be amiſs to make a diſtinction between the Senſe of a Phraſe, as it includes Words not expreſs'd; and the Senſe of the particular Words ſingly conſider'd, juſt as they ſtand: For by this diſtinction, the ſame Sentence may, and may not be literally true, at the ſame time. The literal Senſe of a Word, I call the obvious natural Senſe it has by common Conſent and Cuſtom; for Words are merely arbitrary Signs of Ideas in our Mind, and come to ſignify, properly and literal-

ly, this or that, by Agreement only, and therefore are to be regulated by nothing else.

'Tis just the same with regard to particular Phrases; for Words rang'd in such an Order and Construction, express this or the other Sense by mutual Consent and Use. Tho the Words therefore as they stand, are us'd and join'd together improperly, yet the whole Phrase is nevertheless literally understood to be true, if it signifys what it is constantly us'd to express, which is the case of all proverbial Sentences and figurative Constructions. The foregoing Example in our Mother Tongue, of *staining a Man's Reputation*, will make this plainer. That only which is express'd, contains indeed the literal Sense of the Words; but this making of it self no perfect Sense, together with what is to be understood and supply'd, is the literal and compleat Sense of the Phrase: for tho 'tis but partially express'd, yet the rest is necessarily imply'd and hinted to us; the Occasion, and common Use, together with the Words which are express'd, actually raising in our Minds that part which, on these accounts, it was not so necessary to set down at large, and therefore might safely be omitted: and the Idea which is thus necessarily rais'd in the Mind, is the direct natural, and consequently the literal Sense of the Phrase.

I'm inclin'd to believe, in general, 'tis a Mistake to suppose Words have more than one Signification; and that Words or Sentences are probably never to be understood, but in their literal Sense. And tho it be true, that Sentences sometimes are not to be taken according to the Letter of those Words only which are express'd, yet those Words can by no means be suppos'd to lose or alter their Sense, and receive a new one, but the true full Sense, which is there ellyptically express'd,

preſs'd, is to be made up, as the literal Senſe of the Words us'd, and common Cuſtom, *&c.* ſhall direct.

But I have dwelt too long, perhaps, on theſe things, and might have ſpar'd my Remarks to you, Sir, who have read with ſo much Penetration and Care the Works of that excellent Philoſopher, the late ingenious Mr. *Locke*, and what he has ſo judiciouſly written in the third Book of his *Eſſay on Human Underſtanding*, concerning the Nature and Uſe of Words and Languages, by which you are undoubtedly rais'd above my Remarks. But I judg'd it convenient to recal theſe things to your Mind, tho you might know 'em before; and to acquaint you, that I believe theſe Obſervations fairly apply'd, will remove the imaginary Difficulty of proving βαπτίζω ſignifys only to *dip* or *put into*, &c. and that no ſingle Inſtance can be produc'd to the contrary.

Before I diſmiſs this matter, I will render what I deſign, by diſtinguiſhing between the literal Senſe of the Words, and the literal Senſe of the whole Phraſe, more obvious. I propos'd to ſhew by it, that in reality theſe and all ſuch Paſſages, whatever may be fancy'd to the contrary, are to be underſtood literally, and according to the ſtrict proper Senſe of the Words. For tho taking the Words as they ſtand, they cannot be true, nor indeed have any Senſe at all; as to talk of dipping a thing that is not capable of being dip'd, is Nonſenſe: yet taking the ſame Words to be, as common uſe has made 'em, an Ellypſis; 'tis but ſupplying the other Words which are included, and the Senſe and Conſtruction become very eaſy; and it appears the whole Phraſe, and every particular Word, is to be underſtood literally.

I think

I think it plainly enough follows from all, that Words, even in figurative Constructions, are to be understood literally; and that in these, and all such like Passages, βάπτω, βαπτίζω, &c. signify nothing else but *to dip*, &c. However if notwithstanding all I've said, you shou'd believe I have not wholly taken away the suppos'd Difficulty, yet since these Observations must be allow'd applicable to the Cases in Dispute, and fairly explain and unravel the meaning of these and all such Forms of Speech in so easy and feasible a manner, 'tis an unavoidable Inference;

1. That these Instances, which sincerely I think as good as any that can be brought against us, have no Force at all: for the easy rational Account I have given of 'em, will go far enough at least to render 'em so obscure and doubtful, as to be no Counter-Proof; and I'm persuaded every impartial Antagonist will own they carry the Point much farther, and are strongly on my Side. And,

2. That my Assertion remains in full Force, notwithstanding those Instances which may be offer'd to the contrary; and if so, then 'tis easy to see on which side the Advantage lies: For these doubtful obscure Passages at most, are all the Strength our Adversarys have; whereas we, on the contrary, have a greater number of such as are clear and infallible, where the word can only signify to *dip*, which I shall now go on to prove.

Aristophanes, for I have not yet done with him, tho he may perhaps seem to give room for some Men to cavil in one place or two, which nevertheless you see how fully we are able to account for, affords us convincing Instances, that he thought, the true signification of the word was only to *dip*. In his hated Comedy of *the Clouds*, design'd, with too much Success, to expose and ridicule the

Great

Great *Socrates*, the Philoſopher is ſuppos'd gravely to buſy himſelf, in computing how many times the Diſtance between two of its Legs, a Flea ſprung at one Leap; and in order to meaſure the Diſtance between the two Legs, one of his Pupils is made to deſcribe him uſing this Method: * *He firſt melts a Piece of Wax, and then taking the Flea, he dip'd*, ἐνέβαψεν, *two of its Feet into it*, &c. The other part of this ridiculous Experiment is nothing to our purpoſe, and therefore I omit it.

Another Paſſage you have in his Play, intitled *Peace*, † *Bring me hither the Torch*, ſays one, *and I'll dip it*, ἐμβάψω. To underſtand this, it will be neceſſary to obſerve the Poet introduces ſome Perſons about to ſacrifice to the Goddeſs *Peace*; and, among other Ceremonys, he mentions this of the Torch as one: Now if you pleaſe to remember, Sir, the antient manner of purifying among the *Grecians*, by a lighted Torch, you'll grant it was perform'd by dipping the Torch in Water, and ſo ſprinkling the Perſons or Things concern'd; and 'tis to this effect the *Greek* Scholiaſt explains it, as does *Florent. Chriſtianus* in his Note on this Place, who was the learned Preceptor to *Henry* IV. of *France*, and is honour'd with a very handſom Elogy by the admirable Monſieur *de Thou*.

There is another Paſſage in *Ariſtophanes* very ſtrong to the ſame purpoſe, which however ſome perhaps may fancy favours the contrary: 'tis in his *Parliament of Women*. ‖ *Firſt*, ſays he, *they*

---

* Νεφελ. Act. 1. Scen. 2. Κερὸν διατήξας, εἶτα τὴν ψύλλαν λαβὼν,
Ἐνέβαψεν εἰς τὸ κηρὸν αὐτῆς τὼ πόδε.

† Εἰρην. p. 662. Φέρε δὴ τὸ δᾳδίον τόδ' ἐμβάψω λαβών.

‖ Ἐκκλησιαζ. p. 696. —— Πρῶτα μὲν οὖν ταῦτα βάπτουσι δεξιῷ κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον νόμιμον.

wash,

wash, βάπτουσι, or *dip the Wool in warm Water, according to old Custom.* Here the word implies *Washing*, as Mr. *Wall* won'd have it; and no doubt if he knows of this Place, he thinks it mightily for his purpose, and especially if he has but found that *Suidas* ** and *Phavorinus* † interpret it by πλύνουσι, which *Pliny*, on another occasion, renders *eluunt*, i. e. *they wash out*; and *Stephens* ‖ says, it signifies *lavo*, and is peculiarly spoken of Garments, &c. as λόω is of the Body, and νίπτω of the Hands and Feet. These things may seem of great force, and please Mr. *Wall*, it may be, and a great many more; but I believe you understand this better, Sir, than to lay any stress upon it. Mr. *Wall* indeed finds * *the Sacramental Washing is express'd by Words, which signify Washing in the ordinary and general Sense*; and therefore he infers, *baptize* is not to be limited in its signification to *dip* only: much more then will he insist on this of *Aristophanes*, which in it self plainly speaks of Washing, and is by the Greek Lexicographers interpreted by a word which is always so us'd. But you must needs perceive, Sir, instead of prejudicing, this will be found greatly to confirm my Cause: For in Washing, Wool is and must be dip'd and put into the Water; and that this is the Sense of the word here, I appeal even to *Suidas* and *Phavorinus*, whose Glosses I am very well pleas'd with.

For tho πλύνω (from whence perhaps comes our *English* word *plunge*) does signify to wash, 'tis so far from excluding, that it necessarily implies *dipping*; and accordingly we see it is appropriated to Clothes, &c. which are dip'd into the Water when they are wash'd. *Homer* has a Verse very

** Ad voc. βάπτουσι. † Pag. 352.
‖ Ad voc. πλύνω. * Part II. p. 220.

clear to this effect, where πλύνειν is explain'd, ἑίματ' ἄγεσθαι ἐς ποταμὸν, *to carry and put them into the River* †; and a little after ‖, he describes their manner of washing by a word which expresses the Fullers Custom, says *Stephens*, of *treading* things in the Water: σεῖον, ἐπάτων, says *Pseudo-Didymus*, ἐν βόθροισι, *they tread 'em in great Stone-Basons*, and they must certainly then be first put into the Water; agreeable with this πλύντρια is a Washerwoman, or Laundress, in *Pollux*. It appears now plainly enough from all this, that if the word does signify to wash here, 'tis only *ex consequenti*, and means such a Washing as implys *Dipping*, and is perform'd by it; and therefore this can be of no Service to Mr. *Wall*, unless to convince him of his Mistake.

Besides these Passages, *Harpocration* * has preserv'd a Fragment of one of *Aristophanes*'s Comedys, which are lost; the words are these: *When I* ** *have dip'd, I will cite the Stranger before the Judges.* This Passage wou'd have been very obscure, and I don't know whether any thing wou'd have given Light to it, if *Suidas* had not attempted it; for I take this to be the Passage he refers to, when he says, †† *When I have dip'd the Oar*, &c. which helps us to the sense of the word βάλας in this Place, tho it does not clear up the whole; or perhaps, says he, *it may be a Metaphor taken from the Dyers, who say, for instance, I'll dip it, and make it a black.* *Athenæus* has preserv'd two other Fragments of the same Author, in

† Odyss. ζ. v. 58. ‖ Ibid. v. 92.

* Ad voc. Ναυτοδίκας.

** Ex Δαιταλεῦσιν. Ἤθελον βάλας πρὸς Ναυτοδίκας ξένον ἐξαίφνης.

†† Βάλας τὸν κώπην ἐπλευσας ἐλθὼν πρὸς τὸς Ναυτοδίκας &c.

which

which this word occurs; one is, *What a Wretch am I to be thus dip'd over Head and Ears,* ἀπεβάφθη, *in Brine like a pickled Herring?* I know nothing of the occasion of these Words, and therefore can only say in general, the sense of the word ἀπεβάφθη seems apparent enough. The other Fragment is more obscure, and I can't determine the word by any Circumstances to one Side or t'other, and for that reason I omit it.

I will now bring you an Instance or two from *Aristotle*, who abounds with 'em; but a few may suffice. In his Treatise of the *Soul*, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 12. he says, * *If a Man dips,* βάψειε, *any thing into Wax, as far as it is dip'd, it is mov'd.* Here 'tis impossible to question the meaning of the word, any more than in these following Instances; as where he says, a certain sort of Fish † *can't bear any great Alterations, for Example, to be put into* βάπτεσιν, *a colder Water in Summer:* And that the Flux in Elephants is cur'd, ‖ *by giving 'em warm Water to drink, and Hay dip'd,* βάπτοντες, *in Honey to eat.* Again, speaking of a kind of Serpent bred in *Africa*, he says, those who are bit by it, use for a Remedy a certain ** *Stone found in the Sepulchre of one of their antient Kings, which they put into,* ἀποβάπτοντες, *the Wine they drink.* In another Place he mentions a Pool of *Sicily* (of the same nature with the Lake *Agnano*, near the *Grotto del Cani*, in the Neighbourhood of *Naples*)

* Εἰ εἰς κηρὸν βάψειέ τις, μένει τότε ἐκινήθη. ἕως ἔβαψε.

† Hist. Animal. l. 8. c. 2. fin. Καὶ τὰς μεταβολὰς δ' οὐχ ὑπομένουσι τὰς ἰσχυρὰς, οἷον καὶ τῖς θέρεσιν ἐὰν βάπτωσιν εἰς ψυχρόν.

‖ Hist. Animal. l. 8. c. 26. Καὶ τὴν χόρτην εἰς μέλι βάπτοντες, διδόασιν ἐσθίειν, &c.

** Ibid. c. 29. Τοῦ καὶ λέγεται εἶναι λίθος τις, ὃν λαμβάνουσιν ἀπὸ τάφου βασιλέως τῶν ἀρχαίων, καὶ ἐν οἴνῳ ἀποβάπτοντες, πίνουσι.

† *into which if Birds and other Animals are put,* ἀποσαφῇ, *after they are ſtrangled, they immediately recover.* He ſays alſo, ‖ *'Tis the Cuſtom of ſome Nations,* in order to harden their Children, *to dip 'em,* ἀποβάπτειν, *into cold Water, ſoon after they are born.* Theſe Paſſages are ſo very plain, they want no Illuſtration.

But there is another Place in this Author, and I remember no other in all his Works, which may ſeem to have ſome Difficulty in it, and therefore I will be ſo fair as to mention it. Speaking of ſeveral ſtrange Narrations, he ſays, ‖ *The* Phenicians, *who inhabit* Cadiz, *relate, that ſailing beyond* Hercules's *Pillars, in four days, with the Wind at Eaſt, they came to a Land uninhabited, whoſe Coaſt was full of Seaweeds, and is not laid under Water,* ἐαπτίζεσθαι, *at Ebb; but when the Tide comes in, 'tis wholly cover'd and overwhelm'd.* βαπτίζεσθαι being us'd here to ſignify the Land was under Water, by the Water's coming in upon it, and not by its being put into the Water, ſome perhaps may think it a conſiderable Objection: but it will be found of no advantage to our Adverſarys, if it be obſerv'd, that it here neceſſarily and unavoidably imports to be under Water, or to be overwhelm'd or cover'd with Water; which no way ſutes our *Engliſh* Pædobaptiſts, but is very agreea-

† De Mirabil. Auſcult. non longe ab initio. Περὶ Σικελίαν ὕδωρ φασὶν εἶναι ὑδρηλὸν συρρεμμάτιον, εἰς ὃ τὰ πτηνισμάτια τῶν ὀρνέων καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ζώων, ὅταν ἀποβαφῇ, πάλιν ἀναβιοῖ.

‖ De Republic. l. 7. c. 17. init. Διὸ φασὶ πολλοῖς ἔτεσι τῶν βαρβάρων ἔθος τοῖς μέν, εἰς ποταμὸν ἀποβάπτειν τὰ νεογνὰ ψυχρὸν, &c.

‖ De Mirabil. Auſcult. Λέγεται περὶ φοίνικας τοὺς καλουμένους τὰ Γάδειρα καλυμβα, ἔξω πλέοντας Ἡρακλείων στηλῶν, ἀπηλιώτῃ ἀνέμῳ ἡμέρας τετταρας, φέρεσθαι εἰς τινας τόπους ἐρήμους, θερύων φύκους πλήρεις· ὃς, ὅταν μὲν ἄμπωτις ᾖ, μὴ βαπτίζεσθαι· ὅταν δὲ πλημμύρα καλαχαλύζεσθαι, &c.

ble

ble with what the Antipædobaptists, and the whole *Greek* Church (which one wou'd imagine shou'd understand the force of the word) at this day continue to practise: and this being the plain sense of this Place, 'tis natural enough to say, *as it were*, or, *in a manner*, or some such Expression is to be understood.

Besides, the word βαπτίζω, perhaps, does not so necessarily express the Action of putting under Water, as in general a thing's being in that Condition, no matter how it comes so, whether it is put into the Water, or the Water comes over it; tho indeed to put it into the Water is the most natural way and the most common, and is therefore usually and pretty constantly, but it may be not necessarily imply'd. However that be, the Place makes nothing at all for our Adversarys; and therefore, as they'll not insist on it, I'll dismis it, when I have desir'd you, if you believe there is any Difficulty remaining, to consider it impartially, and examine it by the Rules I laid down for understanding metaphorical, ellyptical, &c. Forms of Speech.

Heraclides Ponticus, a Disciple of *Aristotle*'s, may help us, also, in fixing the Sense of the word; for moralizing the Fable of *Mars*'s being taken in a Net by *Vulcan*, he says, † *Neptune is ingeniously suppos'd to deliver* Mars *from* Vulcan, *to signify, that when a Piece of Iron is taken red-hot out of the Fire, and put into the Water,* βαπτίζεται, *the Heat is repel'd and extinguish'd by the contrary nature of the Water.*

I shou'd have quoted *Herodotus* before, but having some how or other forgot him in his proper

† Allegor. p. 495. Ποσειδῶν δ' ὁ ξυόμενος παρ' Ἡφαίστου τῷ Ἄρει, πιθανῶς. Ἐπειδήπερ ἐκ τῆς καμάνου διάπυρος ὁ τοῦ σιδήρου μύδρος ἐλκυσθεὶς, ὕδατι βαπτίζεται, καὶ τὸ φλογῶδες ὑπὸ τῆ ἰδίας ψύσεως ὕδατι καταστελὲν ἀναπαύεται.

Place, give me leave to tranſcribe a Paſſage or two out of him here. In the 4th *Book of his Hiſtory*, deſcribing the Cuſtoms of the *Scythians*; *Always*, ſays he, ‖ *when they conclude an Alliance with any one, they ratify it in this manner: They fill a large Earthen Veſſel with Wine, and mingle into it Blood drawn from each Party, by making an Inciſion in their Fleſh with a Sword: Into this they dip a Scymiter, ſome Arrows, a Pole-Axe, and a Javelin; and then with many horrid Imprecations, they who treat the League, and the chief Perſons of the Company drink up the Mixture.* In another Place, ſpeaking largely of the Cuſtoms and Antiquitys of the *Egyptians*, he ſays, * *Swine are counted ſuch unclean Beaſts among 'em, that if an* Egyptian *does but touch one in paſſing, he runs to the River, and dips,* ἔβαψε, *himſelf in it, with his Clothes.*

Theocritus uſes the word in the ſame manner, when he ſays, † *Every Morning, inſtead of Water, my Maid ſhall dip me,* βάψαι, *a Cup of Honey*; that is, ſhall fill me a Cup of Honey. Here βάψαι implys her dipping the Cup into ſome large Veſſel of Honey, and can ſignify neither to *waſh* nor *pour*, &c. nor any thing elſe but *dip*. As again, where he ſays, *The Lad let down a mighty*

‖ Melpomen. p. 154. Ὅρκια δὲ ποιεῦνται Σκύθαι ὧδε, πρὸς τοὺς ἂν ποιέωνται· ἐς κυλίνδα μεγάλην χεραμίκην οἶνον ἐγχέαντες, αἷμα συμμίσγουσι τῶν τὰ ὅρκια ταμνόμενοι, πύρανες ὑπεραὶ ἢ ὀϊστοὶ μαχαίρῃ σμικρὸν τοῦ σώματος· καὶ ἔπειτα ἀποβάψαντες ἐς τὴν κύλικα ἀκινάκεα, καὶ ἀξίνας καὶ σαγάριν καὶ ἀκόντιον. ἐπεὰν δὲ ταῦτα ποιήσωσι, καταυχόνται πολλὰ· καὶ ἔπειτα ἀποπίνουσι αὐτοί τε οἱ τὸ ὅρκιον ποιεύμενοι, καὶ τῶν ἑπομένων οἱ πλείστου ἄξιοι.

* Euterpe, p. 68. Τὸν δὲ Αἰγύπτιοι μιαρὸν ἡγέονται θηρίων εἶναι καὶ τοῦτο ὦν, ἤν τις ψαύσῃ αὐτῶν παριὼν ὑὸς, αὐτοῖσι τοῖσι ἱματίοισι ἀπαὼν ἔβαψε ἑωυτὸν, βὰς ἐς τὸν ποταμόν.

† Idyll. 5. v. 126. — Καὶ τὸ ποτ' ὄρθρον
Ἃ παῖς ἀνθ' ὕδατος τὰν κάλπιδα κηρίῳ βάψαι.

Pitcher,

Pitcher ‖, *and made haſte to dip it*, βάψαι, viz. in the Water.

Moſchus, cautioning againſt *Cupid*'s Treacherys and Arrows, ſays, *They are deceitful all, and Preſents dip'd*, βέβαπται, *in Fire:* that is, as ſome Nations uſually dip their Arrows in the rankeſt Poiſons, to render the Wounds they give incurable; ſo *Cupid*'s are, as it were, dip'd in Fire, to create Pain and Anguiſh.

As near as I can remember, moſt of the Inſtances which follow are plain and eaſy, like thoſe immediately preceding; ſo that I ſhall but juſt mention 'em (except when I come to *Callimachus*) and add no Expoſition. If this prove tireſom and inſipid, you cannot cenſure me, ſince you have ingag'd me to give you ſo particular an account of the word, which cou'd not be done without being tireſom both to your ſelf and me.

I don't know whether *Aratus*, in his *Phænomena*, uſes the word above three times. One is in deſcribing the Setting of the Conſtellation *Cepheus*, in the Latitude of about 69 or 70 Degrees, where he calls it, * *Dipping*, βάπτων, or *plunging his upper Parts into the Sea.* And the *Latins* frequently interpret the word, as ‖‖ *Ovid* does, by *mergo* in theſe Caſes. And again, giving that ſame Rule for judging of the Weather, which our LORD mentions *Mat.* 16. 2. *Aratus* ſays, † *But if the Sun dips*, βάπτοι, *himſelf without a Cloud into the Weſtern*

‖ Idyll. 13. v. 46. Ἦτοι ὁ κὤρος ἐπεῖχε ποτὶ πολυχανδέα χρωσὸν
Βάψαι ἐπειγόμενος.

* V. 650. —— Τὰ μὲν εἰς κεφαλὰν μάλα πάντα
Βάπτων ὠκεανοῖο.

‖‖ *Faſt. l.* 4. *p.* 80. Ante tamen quam ſumma dies ſpectacula ſiſtat,
Enſifer Orion æquore merſus erit.

† V. 858. Εἰδ' ὁ μὲν αὐτόκελος βάπτοι ῥόον ἑσπερίοιο, &c.

Sea, &c. Laſtly, repeating more Prognoſtications of the Weather, †† *If the Crow dips*, ἐβάψατο, *his Head into the River*, &c.

My Opinion is confirm'd alſo by *Callimachus*, in his Hymns, when he ſays, (*a*) *Ye* Grecian *Water-women* (they furniſh'd private Houſes with Water, as ſome do among us) *dip not your Veſſels in the River* Inachus *to day*. The Hymn was made on the ſolemnizing the Feſtival of waſhing the Statue of *Pallas*; which Ceremony was perform'd, by Perſons ſet apart for that purpoſe, in the River *Inachus*, a little before day: from this River the Inhabitants were uſually ſupply'd with Water, which makes the Poet, in veneration to the Goddeſs, charge the Water-Women here not to dip their Pitchers in the River on that day. This is clearly the Senſe; and therefore they who have tranſlated it by *lavate*, *waſh*, conſonant with Mr. *Wall*'s Notion of the word, are groſly miſtaken: and I wonder *Theodorus Grævius*, who began, and his incomparable Father, who compleated the late curious Edition of this Author, have left this Fault untouch'd, eſpecially if they were timely enough poſſeſs'd of that immenſe Treaſury, the illuſtrious Baron *Spanheim*'s Remarks on *Callimachus*, who particularly corrects this Error, with great Solidity of Argument. *Politian* too had render'd it very juſtly by *tingete*, *dip*, and did not deſerve the Cenſure of that honourable Critick, tho indeed he has treated him with his uſual Decency and Mildneſs: For as Baron *Spanheim* himſelf notes, the old Scholiaſt on *Nicander*, who has us'd the word juſt in the ſame manner as *Callimachus* here does, interprets it by

---

†† V. 951. Ἤπυ χὴ πολαμοῖο ἐβάψατο μέχει παρ' ἄκρης
Ὦμυς ἐκ κεφαλῆς, &c.

(*a*) In Lavacr. Pallad. v. 45. Σάμερον ὑδροφόροι μὴ βάπτετε. γέμιζε,

γέμιζε, which signifys to *fill*; and this must be done by dipping. This, if possible, is still more evident from the Passage I just now cited from *Theocritus*, **The Boy let down his mighty Pitcher in haste to dip it.* And *Aristophanes* expresses the same Sense, tho on another occasion, thus: †*With Pitchers fetch me Water from the River.* And so *Aristotle* uses αἴρειν, on the like occasion, *Quæst. Mechanic. c.* 29. And *Constantine* observes from an Epigram of *Hermolaus*, ἐς ὕδατος κρώσσον ἐβάψε, *He dip'd his Pitcher in the Water.* The mysterious *Lycophron* affords us an Instance parallel to this, in *Callimachus*; ‖ *dipping*, βάψαντος, *with strange and foreign Buckets*: and *Canterus* renders the Word here by *Tingentes*, as *Politian* has done in *Callimachus*; which is certainly the true and literal Sense. And the *Greek* Scholiast on *Euripides*, who uses the Word likewise exactly to the same purpose, in the place above cited, says expresly, as I there transcrib'd him,** βάπτειν *signifys to let or put down into Water*; and yet at the same time he interprets βάψασα *dipping*, (*Euripides*'s Word) by γεμίσασα *filling*; which shews he understood it in that and other such places, to signify *to fill by dipping*.

To this may be added what *Aristotle* says in his *Mechanical Questions*, ††*The Bucket must be first let down*, or *dip'd*, βάπτει, *and then be drawn up again*, viz. when it is full. When his Excellency, therefore, corrects *Politian*, and renders the Word here by *Haurite*, as *Scaliger* has done that in *Lycophron* by *Haurientes*; he is not to be suppos'd to

---

* Idyl. 13. v. 46. Ἦτο ὁ κὤρος ἐπεὶ χὰ ποτὶ πολυχανδέα κρωσσὸν
Βάψαι ἐπειγόμενος.

† Ran. Act. 5. Scen. 2. Καλπισί τ' ἐκ πολαμῶν δ' ὄσον ἄρατε.

‖ Cassandr. v. 1365. Κρωσσοῖσιν ὀθνείοισι βάψασ' γάνος.

** Βάπτειν ἐστὶ τὸ χαλᾶν τι εἰς ὕδωρ, ἢ εἰς ἕτερον τι ὑγρόν.

†† Cap. 29. Βάπτει γὰρ δεῖ, καὶ τοῦτ' ἄνω ἕλκουσι.

mean,

mean, it does not ſignify to *dip*, in that place, but only that the Latin *Tingo* does not ſo fully and properly expreſs the Poet's Senſe, as *Haurio* does; and ſo tho *Tingo*, by a Metalepſis, is the true Senſe of βάπτω, (for as *Voſſius* remarks, ‖ *Immerſion is before tinging, for things are ting'd by it*) yet *Haurio* is more proper when we ſpeak of drawing or taking up Water out of a River. *Ovid* uſes it thus; *Faſtor. lib.* 4. *Et Manibus puram Fluminis hauſit Aquam, And with her Hands ſhe ſcoop'd the Chryſtal Flood.* In this Paſſage 'tis obvious, that by *Manibus Aquam haurire*, he muſt neceſſarily mean, *to take up Water in the Hands, by dipping them into it:* and ſo the Phraſe includes dipping, as undoubtedly thoſe great Men deſign'd it ſhou'd, when they tranſlated βάπτω by *Haurio*, as the apteſt *Latin* Word, and exactly in the ſame Senſe as *Ovid* here uſes it.

A thing of this nature, and ſo evident, did not indeed need to have been ſo largely treated as it has already been: but the unaccountable Tenacity of our Antagoniſts, together with your Commands, have made it neceſſary to be very particular, and therefore I muſt proceed to add ſome few Inſtances more.

Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus deſcribing the warm Duel between *Aruns* and *Brutus*, has this Expreſſion; † *One thruſt his Spear,* βάψας, *between the other's Ribs, who at the ſame Inſtant puſh'd his into his Enemy's Belly.* In the Life of *Homer*, which that excellent Philologiſt Dr. *Gale* has prov'd * to have been written by this *Dionyſius*, we have a ve-

‖ Etymologic. ad voc. Baptiſmus Poſterior eſt Immerſione Tinctura, quia hæc Immerſione fit.

† Antiq. Rom. lib. 5. p. 278. Ὁ μὲ εἰς τὰς πλευρὰς βάψας τὴν αἰχμὴν, ὁ δὲ εἰς τὰς λαγόνας.

* Præfat. ad Opuſcul. Mythologic.

ry

ry remarkable Paſſage. The Biographer is pointing out ſome of the innumerable Beautys in *Homer*'s incomparable Poems, and takes notice particularly of one in the *ſixteenth Iliad*, v. 333. where *Ajax* is deſcrib'd killing *Cleobulus*: † *He ſtruck him acroſs the Neck with his heavy Sword: And the whole Sword became warm with the Blood*, ſays the Poet. By which is emphatically expreſs'd, how much the Sword was dip'd in, ἐβαπτίσθη, (as *Pſeudo-Didymus* explains it) and wet with Blood. And *Dionyſius*'s Words, for the ſake of which I mention this, are theſe: ‖ *In that Phraſe*, Homer *expreſſes himſelf with the greateſt Energy, ſignifying, that the Sword was ſo dip'd*, κατωτιδέντα, *in Blood, that 'twas even heated by it.*

Strabo is very plain in ſeveral Inſtances: ſpeaking of the Lake near *Agrigentum*, a Town on the South-ſhore of *Sicily*, now call'd *Gergenti*, he ſays, * *Things which otherwiſe will not ſwim, don't ſink*, καταΐζεσθαι, *in the Water of this Lake, but float like Wood.* And there is a Rivulet in the South-Parts of *Cappadocia*, he tells us, †† *whoſe Waters are ſo buoyant, that if an Arrow is thrown in, it will hardly ſink or be dip'd*, βαπτίζεσθαι, *into 'em.* Again, ſpeaking of the daring Attempt of *Alexander* at *Phaſelis*, at the foot of *Climax*, a Mountain in *Lycia*, between which and the Sea the Paſſage is very narrow, he obſerves, that at High-water,

---

† —— Πλήξας ξίφει ἀυχένα κωπήεντι
Πᾶν δ' ὑπεθερμάνθη ξίφος αἵματι. ——

‖ Vit. Homer. p. 297. Πᾶν δ' ὑπεθερμάνθη ξίφος αἵματι. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ παφέχει μείζονα ἔμφασιν, ὡς βαπτισθέντος οὕτω τοῦ ξίφους, ὥς τε θερμανθῆναι.

* Lib. 6. p. 421. Οὐδὲ γὰρ τοῖς ἀκολύμβοις βαπτίζεσθαι συμβαίνει, ξύλων τρόπον ἐπιπολάζουσιν.

†† Lib. 12. p. 809. Τῷ δὲ καθιέντι ἀκόντιον ἄνωθεν εἰς τὸ βάθος, ἢ ἴσα τοῦ ὕδατος ἀντωθεῖται πρόσω, ὥστε μόλις βαπτίζεσθαι.

and

and eſpecially in Winter, at which time *Alexander* was there, 'tis overflow'd by the Sea; but notwithſtanding, the King, impatient of Delays, led on his Army, and * *the Soldiers march'd a whole Day thro the Water, dip'd,* βαπτιζομένων, *up to the Waſte.* In another place, aſcribing the fabulous Propertys of the *Aſphaltites* to the Lake *Sirbon*, he ſays, † *the Bitumen floats a-top, becauſe of the Nature of that Water, which admits no diving; for if a Man goes into it, he can't ſink, or be dip'd,* βαπτίζεσθαι, *but is forcibly kept above.* Take one Inſtance more from this Author, who a little after, in the ſame Book, mentions a ſort of wild *Arabs*, whom he calls *Elephantophagi*, or Elephant-Eaters; ſome of whom, among other Artifices, he tells you, they made uſe of to catch the Elephant, ‖ *kill'd him with Arrows dip'd,* βεβαμμένοις, *in the Gall of Serpents.*

Plutarch, in his Treatiſe concerning the Education of Children, adviſes not to overtask 'em; and adds: ‖‖‖ *I have known ſome Fathers, who thro exceſſive Fondneſs, have not truly lov'd their Children at all. To make my ſelf better underſtood by an In-*

---

* Lib. 14. p. 982. Καὶ ὅλως τὴν ἡμέραν ἐν ὕδατι γενέσθαι τῷ πορείαν συνέξη, μέχει ὀμφαλῶ βαπτιζομένων.

† Lib. 16. p. 1108. Ἔιτ' ἐπιπολάζουσι διὰ τὴν φύσιν τοῦ ὕδατος ἐκείνου, μηδὲ κολυμβᾶν δεῖσθαι, μηδὲ βαπτίζεσθαι τὰ ἐμβαίνοντα, ἀλλ' ἐξαίρεσθαι.

‖ Lib. 16. p. 1117. Τίνες δὲ καὶ τοξεύμασιν ἀναιρεῖσιν αὐτὸς χολῇ βεβαμμένοις ὄφεων ὀϊστοῖς.

‖‖‖ Pag. 15. Ἤδη δέ τινας ἐγὼ εἶδον πατέρας οἷς τὸ λίαν φιλεῖν τοῦ μὴ φιλεῖν αἴτιον κατέστη. τί γὰρ ἐστὶν ὃ βέλομαι λέγειν; ἵνα τοῦ παραδείγματι φανερώτερον ποιήσω τὸν λόγον. σπεύδοντες γὰρ τοὺς παῖδας ἐν πᾶσι τάχιον σοφοὺς γενέσθαι, πόνος αὐτοῖς ὑπερμέτρως ἐπεβάλλετον, οἷς ἀπαυδῶντες ἐμπίπτουσι, καὶ ἄλλως καρυνόμενοι ταῖς καλοκαγαθίαις, ἃ δέχονται τὴν μάθησιν εὐλυσίως. ὥσπερ γὰρ τὰ φυτὰ τοῖς μὲν μετρίοις ὕδασι τρέφεται, τοῖς δὲ πολλοῖς πνίγεται, ἡ αὐτὴ τροφὴ ψυχὴ τοῖς μὲν συμμέτροις αὔξεται πόνοις, τοῖς δ' ὑπερβάλλουσι βαπτίζεται.

ſtance:

ſtance: Being eager to have their Children early admir'd, and excel in all things, they lay Burdens on 'em that bear no proportion to their Strength, and only ſerve to oppreſs and jade 'em. And when they are thus fatigu'd, 'tis impoſſible their Minds ſhou'd improve: for as Plants thrive and flouriſh, when they are moderately water'd, but wither and pine away if you drench 'em too much; ſo the Mind if moderately exercis'd with Labours proportionable to its Abilitys, grows more vigorous; but too much Toil, καταβίζεται, *as it were drowns and overwhelms it.*

If this Paſſage ſhou'd ſeem to be a little obſcure, I muſt refer you, Sir, to what I have ſaid before, which will effectually take away all the Difficulty, and which I need not repeat. But I will give another Inſtance from *Plutarch*, that ſhall be evident enough. Relating the Stratagem of a *Roman* General a little before he dy'd of his Wound, he ſays, that * *he ſet up a Trophy, on which having dipt,* καταβίσας, *his Hand in Blood, he wrote this Inſcription*, &c.

I have almoſt tir'd my ſelf, and will mention but two or three places more. Take one from *Lucian*; who deſcribing the cruel inhuman Diſpoſition of *Timon*, that monſtrous *Athenian*, who bore a profeſs'd inconceivable Hatred to Human Kind, makes him expreſs himſelf thus: † *Shou'd I ſee any one*, ſays he, *in the midſt of raging Flames*, juſt ready to take hold on him; *and ſhou'd he earneſtly beg me to put out the Fire, I'd pour on Pitch and Oil: If a Man were hurry'd down a rapid Stream,*

---

* Parall. Græc. Rom. p. 545. Καὶ εἰς τὸ αἷμα τὴν χεῖρα καταβίσας, ἔσησε τρόπαιον ἐπιγράψας, &c.

† Lucian. Vol. I. p. 139. Εἰ δέ τινα ἴδοιμι ἐν πυρὶ διαφθειρόμενον, καὶ σβεννύναι ἱκετεύοντα, πίττῃ καὶ ἐλαίῳ καταβεννύναι; καὶ ἢν τινα τῷ χειμῶνι ὁ ποταμὸς παραφέρῃ, ὁ δὲ, τὰς χεῖρας ὀρέγων, ἀντιλαβέσθαι δέηται, ὠθεῖν καὶ τόπον ἐπὶ κεφαλὴν βαπτίζοντα, ὡς μὴ δὲ ἀναχύψαι δυνηθείη.

and

and with out-ſtretch'd Hands cry'd to me for Help, I'd thruſt him down when ſinking, Καταπίζοντα, *he never ſhou'd riſe again.*

The pious Emperor *Marcus Antoninus*, in his admirable Meditations, uſes the Word whoſe Senſe we are ſettling, ſeveral times; but I think always metaphorically; ſo that, indeed, it is not very fair to argue from thoſe Paſſages. However, leſt my Adverſarys ſhou'd imagine they make againſt me, I will touch upon 'em.

In the third Book, he draws the Character of ſuch a one as he thinks may be reckon'd a Man of true Merit; and ſays, he ‖ *is not to be corrupted with Pleaſures, nor broken by Misfortunes; unmov'd with Calumnys and Slanders; a Conqueror in that noble Strife of maſtering and ſubduing the Paſſions, and,* Βεβαμμένον, *dip'd*, as it were, *in*, or ſwallow'd up *with Juſtice*; that is, perfectly juſt: as we ſay, Perſons giv'n up to their Pleaſures and Vices, are immers'd in, or ſwallow'd up with Pleaſures or Wickedneſs. So 'tis in 1 *Tim.* vi. 9. *They that will be rich, fall into Temptation, and a Snare, and into many fooliſh and hurtful Luſts, which drown Men in Deſtruction and Perdition.* Again, the Imperial Moraliſt ſays, * *Such as the Thoughts are which you are moſt poſſeſs'd with, ſuch will your Mind be; for the Thoughts,* Βάπτεται, *dip* or *tincture the Mind:* Βάπτε, *dip*, or *tincture it, therefore, by accuſtoming your ſelf to ſuch Thoughts as theſe*, &c. In the ſixth Book, and I think the Word occurs no oftner in all theſe noble Meditations, the Emperor ſays,

---

‖ §. 4. p. 17. Τὸν Ἄνθρωπον ἄχραντον ἡδονῶν, ἄτρωτον ὑπὸ παντὸς πόνου, πάσης ὕβρεως ἀνέπαφον, πάσης ἀνδαιδάλτου πανουργίας, ἀθλητὴν ἄθλου τοῦ μεγίστου, τοῦ ὑπὸ μηδενὸς πάθους καταβληθῆναι, δικαιοσύνῃ βεβαμμένον εἰς βάθος.

* Lib. 5. §. 16. p. 41. Οἷα ἂν πολλάκις φαντασθῇς, τοιοῦτος ἔσται ἡ διάνοια· βάπτεται γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν φαντασιῶν ἡ ψυχή. Βάπτε οὖν αὐτὴν, τῇ συνεχείᾳ τῶν τοιούτων φαντασιῶν &c.

Don't

* *Don't make the former Emperors the Pattern of your Actions, leſt,* βαφῆς, *you are infected* or *ſtain'd*, or as it were dip'd and dy'd, *viz.* in Miſtakes or Vices. The Period is extremely Ellyptical, and ſtands in need of theſe or ſuch Supplements to make out the Senſe in another Language, wherein that defective Form is not in uſe.

I don't ſee any Advantage our Adverſarys can poſſibly pretend to from theſe or any the like Paſſages: That they are metaphorical, none can queſtion; nor, in my opinion, can it be doubted, but they neceſſarily allude to, and imply *dipping*; for only in that Senſe of the Word can the Metaphor be juſtify'd, which, according to *Cicero*'s Rule †, is natural, and not too licentious.

But to paſs this, I wou'd only note, that *Plato*, in his admirable Commentarys concerning Government, has purſu'd this Metaphor very cloſely, and thereby ſhewn us the Propriety of it, and how expreſſive it is; for which reaſon I will tranſcribe him at large.

‖ *The Dyers, when they are about to dip a Quantity of Wool to make it of a purple Colour, cull out the whiteſt of the Fleece, and prepare and work it with*

a

---

* §. 30. Pag. 52. Ὅρα μὴ ἀποκαισαρωθῇς, μὴ βαφῇς.

† *Ad Heren. lib.* 4. *p.* 57. Tranſlationem pudentem eſſe oportere, ut cum ratione in conſimilem rem tranſeat, ne ſine delectu temere & cupide videatur in diſſimilem tranſcurriſſe.

‖ Plato de Republica, lib. 4. p. 637. E. Οἱ βαφεῖς ἐπειδὰν ζηλωθῶσι βάψαι ἔρια, ὡς ἔστιν ἀληθῆ, πρῶτον μὲν ἐκλέγονται ἐκ πολλῶν χρωμάτων μίαν φύσιν τὴν τῆς λευκῆς· ἔπειτα προπαρασκευάζουσιν οὐκ ὀλίγῃ προσκαθῇ θεραπεύσαντες, ὅπως δέξωνται ὅτι μάλιστα τὸ ἀνθος καὶ ὅτω δὴ βάπτουσι καὶ ὃ μὲν ἂν τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ βαφῇ δύσσηπτον γίγνεται τὸ βαφέν. καὶ ἡ πλύσις ἔτ' ἄνευ ῥυμμάτων ὅτε μετὰ ῥυμμάτων δύναται ἀυτῶν τὸ ἄνθος ἀφαιρεῖσθαι. ἃ δ' ἂν μὴ οἶσθα οἷα γίγνεται ἐάν τε πῆς ἄλλα χρώματα βάπτῃ, ἐάν τε καὶ ταῦτα μὴ προσθεραπεύσας, ὅτι ἐκλυτα καὶ γελοῖα; τοιοῦτον τοίνυν ἴσθι καὶ ἐπὶ δύναμιν ἐργάζεσθαι καὶ

a world of trouble, that it may the better take the Grain; and then they dip it, βάπτουσι. *The Dye of Things thus dip'd is lasting and unchangeable, and cannot be fetch'd out or tarnish'd, either by fair Water, or any Preparations for discharging of Colours. But things which are not dy'd after this manner, you know what they are; no matter what Dye they are dip'd in,* βάπτῃ, *they never look well; without this Preparation they take but a nasty Colour, and that is easily wash'd out too. And thus in like manner our chusing Soldiers, and instructing 'em in Musick, and those Exercises which consist in Agility of Body, you must imagine our Design is only to make 'em the better receive the Laws, which are a Kind of Dye, that their Tempers being form'd by a proper Discipline may be fix'd and unalterable by Terror,* &c. *and* βαφὴ, *their Tincture may not be wash'd out by any Medicaments of the most powerfully expelling Nature; as Pleasure which is stronger to this Effect, than any Lye, as is likewise Grief, Fear or Desire,* and the like.

The Figure, you see Sir, is maintain'd quite thro the Passage, by applying the Dyers Terms to the Things of the Mind. I find *Gataker* also has transcrib'd this Place a little more at large, together with several others from *Seneca*, &c. to the same Effect, in his Learned Note on the Words above cited, in the 4th §. of *Antoninus*'s Third Book; which if you think it needful you may be pleas'd to turn to, for they considerably illustrate my Asser-

---

καὶ ἡμᾶς, ὅτε ἐξελεγόμεθα, τὰς στρατιώτας καὶ ἐπαιδεύομεν μουσικῇ καὶ γυμναστικῇ· καὶ μηδὲν οἴει ἄλλο μηχανᾶσθαι, ἢ ὅπως ἡμῖν ὅτι κάλλιστα τὰς νόμους παραδέντης δέξοιντο, ὥσπερ βαφὴν, ἵνα ἀδιαποτοὶς αὐτῆς ἡ δόξα γίγνοιτο καὶ περὶ δεινῶν καὶ περὶ τ' ἄλλων, διὰ τὸ τὴν τε φύσιν καὶ τὴν τριφὴν ἐπιτηδείαν ἀφικέναι· καὶ μὴ αὐτῆς ἐκπλύναι τὴν βαφὴν τὰ ῥύμματα ταῦτα, δεινὰ ὄντα ἐκκλύζειν, ἡ τε ἡδονὴ, παντὸς χαλαστρότερα δεινοτέρα ὅσα τοῦτο δρᾷν καὶ κονίας, λύπη τε καὶ φόβος καὶ ἐπιθυμία, παντὸς ἄλλα ῥύμματος.

tion:

tion. But give me leave to add another Paſſage much like the preceding one of *Plato*, which juſt comes into my mind; 'tis part of *Lyſis*'s Epiſtle to *Hipparchus*, publiſh'd by the Learned Dr. *Gale*, in his *Opuſcula Mythologica*: Speaking of *Pythagoras*'s Method with his Pupils, * *As Dyers, ſays he, firſt cleanſe and waſh Clothes which are to be dy'd, in ſome Aſtringent, that ſo they may take a more durable Colour; in like manner, that Great Man us'd to prepare ſuch as came to learn of him,* &c. Mentioning of theſe Metaphors gives me occaſion to remember the Words of *Plutarch* concerning *Otho*, whom *Junius* was ſolliciting *Galba* to nominate his Succeſſor in the Empire; and tho 'tis out of due Order, as having diſpatch'd *Plutarch* before, I'll mention 'em here, the word βαπτίζω being us'd as figuratively as in the Paſſage above: † *He was, ſays* Plutarch, *over head and ears* [βεβαπτισμένον] *in debt*; which is exactly our *Engliſh* Phraſe.

Pollux, in the Work he compos'd for the Service of the Emperor *Commodus*, to teach him to ſpeak *Greek* correctly, puts ‖ βαπτίζεσθαι for a Ship's being *ſunk* and *totally immers'd* in the Sea.

I'll add but one Inſtance more, which ſhall be out of *Themiſtius*; who ſays, ** *The Pilot can't tell but he may ſave one in the Voyage, that had better be drown'd,* [βαπτίσαι] ſunk into the Sea.

---

* Pag. 737. Καθάπερ γὰρ οἱ βαφεῖς προεκπλύναντες ἔρυψαν τὰ βάμματα τῶν ἱματίων, ὅπως ἀνέκπλυτον τὸν βαφὴν ἀναπίωσι, καὶ μηδέποκα γιγνησομένην ἐξίτηλον ἔχωσιν αὐτὸν ὁ δαιμόνιος τρόπον τινὰ παρεσκεύαζε τὰς φιλοσοφίας ἐκμανθάνοντας, ὅπως μὴ, &c.

† Moral. Tom. 3. Galba, p. 1504. Καὶ πεντακισχιλίων μυριάδων ὀφλήμασι βεβαπτισμένον.

‖ Onomaſtic. Lib. 1. c. 9. Τὰ δὲ πάθη οὕτως ἂν ἔποις. ζημιάζεσθαι, σαλεύειν, ὠθεῖσθαι, ἀποθεῖσθαι, παρασύρεσθαι, συγκλύζεσθαι, κατασύρεσθαι, ἢ καταδύεσθαι, βαπτίζεσθαι, ἀναλίσκεσθαι, &c.

** Orat. 4. p. 133. Οὔτε ὁ κυβερνήτης, εἰ σώζει ἐν τῷ πλῷ τὸν καὶ βαπτίσαι ἄμεινον ἦν.

Thus I put an end to my laborious Task: You ſee, Sir, how many Examples I have produc'd, and I might eaſily enumerate as many more, from the Authors I have nam'd, and likewiſe from thoſe I have wholly omitted; but I'm wearied with heaping up dry Sentences, only to get at the Senſe of a Word, which I think ſufficiently clear already, and altogether as plain of it ſelf as any thing in the World can make it. Your expreſly obliging me to this Service is a very good Excuſe; and yet I can hardly forbear thinking I had need ſay ſomething more, but that I conſider it was apparently neceſſary to do as I have done, ſince ſome Perſons ſo confidently pretend, and withal ſo very unreaſonably, that βαπτίζω do's not always ſignify to *dip*; and among the reſt Mr. *Wall* is one. He takes the Liberty to ſay, *Mr.* Walker *has largely ſhewn from the Greek Authors, and Lexicographers and Criticks, that beſides the ſignification* Immergo, *they give it that of* Lavo *in general.* Whereas you ſee, Sir, I have fully baffled all that is alledg'd from any Paſſages in the *Grecian* Writers: As to Lexicographers and Criticks, were it ſo material, I cou'd eaſily prove him to be very much miſtaken there alſo: The *Greek* Lexicographers afford him no ground at all for his Pretence; and the moſt Learned of the others, if they do interpret the word by *lavo*, don't mean, as he pretends, any *waſhing* in general, but only ſuch as is perform'd by *dipping:* for they may render it well enough by *lavo*, the general Word, which comprehends *mergo* the particular.

I know it ſignifys to *waſh*, as a Conſequence of Dipping; but ſo likewiſe it do's to wet, colour, dye, drown, and to poiſon: it alſo ſignifys to put on CHRIST, and to be bury'd with him, as the Apoſtle himſelf teaches us. But what I have further to ſay I muſt leave to my next. *I am*, &c.

LET

LETTER IV.

Criticks constantly affirm, the proper and genuine Sense of βαπτίζω *is* immergo, *&c. So* Vossius, Constantine *and* Stephanus *render it. A Testimony from* Casaubon. *His poor Evasion. Another from* Grotius. *Another from* Dionysius Petavius. *'Tis needless to collect more. Mr.* Wall *conscious, notwithstanding his Pretence, that the Opinions of learned Men are against him. Whereas Mr.* Wall *appeals to the Scriptures for the Sense of the Word, 'tis shewn largely to be never there us'd in his Sense, but the contrary.* Lev. xiv. 6. *consider'd. That the Word does not always necessarily signify to dip all over, is the most that can be infer'd from it; besides, here it means to dip all over.* Isa. xxi. 4. Ezek. xxv. 15. Dan. iv. 33. & v. 21. *consider'd. Hot Climates very dewy. The* Syriac *Version confirms our Sense.* Eccluſ. xxxi. 26. 2 Macc. i. 21. Eccluſ. xxxiv. 26. *consider'd. The Purification enjoin'd for touching that which is dead, to be perform'd by Sprinkling. Together with Dipping. The* Mahometans *purify in such Cases by washing all over. Washing was the main Part of the Purification among the* Jews. *For which reason the Son of* Sirach *uses this Word to intend the whole Ceremony.* Luke xi. 38. *consider'd. Mr.* Wall *pretends the* Jews *always wash'd their Hands, by having Water pour'd on 'em. Which is false. The Priests wash'd their Hands and Feet by dipping 'em. Our* LORD *wash'd his Disciples Feet so likewise. The Authority of the* Rabbins *not to be depended on. Dr.* Pocock *allows, the* Jews *were oblig'd sometimes to wash*

by Dipping. And from thence accounts for the uſe of the word βαπτίζεσθαι, Mark vii. 4. *Mr.* Wall's *next Inſtance, which is* Mark vii. 4. *conſider'd. Thoſe that came from the Market did waſh by Dipping. Sects among the* Jews *who waſh'd themſelves frequently. The Words may refer to the things brought from the Market.* Heb. ix. 10. *and* Mat. xxvi. 23. *conſider'd. The Sacramental Waſhing being expreſs'd by Words, which ſignify any kind of Waſhing, does not prove it may therefore be adminiſter'd by any kind of Waſhing. Words, like our Ideas, have their* Genera *and* Species. *Words of a more particular Senſe ſhou'd explain the more general, and not the contrary.*

SIR,

THE proper and genuine Senſe of βαπτίζω, the Criticks conſtantly affirm, is *immergo, mergo,* &c. *Conſtantine* almoſt always renders it ſo, and *Stephens* never fails to do it, and explains it to ſignify * to *dye*, or *waſh by dipping*; till in another Period he inclines to ſhew a little Favour to the Authority of the Church, and her Practice, and to that end indeed interprets it by *lavo, abluo,* &c. But he confirms this Expoſition by no Examples, except two from Scripture, *Mark* vii. 4. and *Luke* xi. 28. which we ſhall examine by and by, and ſome from the later Eccleſiaſtical Writers.

And yet, at the ſame time, he can't forbear blaming ſuch as uſe thoſe words in relation to the Chriſtian Sacrament, and ſays expreſly, *That* † Tertullian *render'd it more properly by* mergitare,

* Ad voc. βαπτίζω, ut quæ tingendi aut abluendi gratiâ aquæ immergimus.

† Ad voc. βαπτίζω. Tertullianus de Corona Militis, magis propriè interpretatus eſt mergitare, ſervata propter trinam immerſionem, forma quam frequentativam Grammatici vocant.

on account of the trine Immersion in Baptism, retaining what the Grammarians call the frequentative Termination.

The great *Vossius* speaks exactly to the same purpose, and indeed almost in the same words; for without ever taking the least notice of *lavo*, or the like, he expresly says, * *Tho* βάπτω *and* βαπτίζω *are render'd by* mergo *or* mergito, *and* tingo, *yet they properly signify* mergo; *and* tingo *only by a Metalepsis*, i. e. as *tingo* implys *mergo:* and therefore he adds, † *Tinging follows Immersion, and is done by it.* Also in his Treatise of Baptism, as well as here, he translates the *Greek* word by *mergo*, and says again, that's its proper signification; and, farther than this, that particularly when it relates to the Christian Sacrament, it shou'd of choice be render'd by *mergito*, as you may see in his *Etymologicon* at the word *Baptismus.*

Casaubon, no inconsiderable Judg in matters of this nature, is very expres in his Note on *Matth.* iii. 6. which being so remarkable, I'll transcribe the whole Passage: ‖ *For the manner of Baptizing*, says he, *was to plunge* or dip *'em into the Water, as even the word* βαπτίζειν *it self plainly enough shews, which as it does not signify* δύνειν, *to sink down and perish, neither certainly does it signify* ὑπιπολάζειν, *to swim or float a-top; these three words,* ὑπιπολάζειν, βαπτίζειν, δύνειν, *being very different. Hence it appears,*

---

* *Etymologic. in Voc. Baptismus.* Etsi autem βάπτω & βαπτίζω, tum *mergo*, vel *mergito*, tum *tingo* transferri soleant; propriè tamen *mergo* notat, & μεταληπτικῶς, tingo.

† *Ibid.* Nam posterior est Immersione Tinctura, quia hæc Immersione fit.

‖ Hic enim fuit baptizandi Ritus, ut in Aquas immergerentur: quod vel ipsa vox βαπτίζειν declarat satis; quæ ut non significat δύνειν, quod est *fundum petere cum sua pernicie*, ita profectò non est ὑπιπολάζειν. Differunt enim hæc tria,

pears, that 'twas not without reaſon that ſome have long ſince inſiſted on the Immerſion of the whole Body in Baptiſm, for which they urge the word βαπτίζειν. *But their Opinion is juſtly long ſince exploded, the Force and Energy of this ſacred Myſtery not conſiſting in that Circumſtance.* A very poor Evaſion for ſo great a Man, after he had granted ſo much: He allows Baptiſm was adminiſter'd by Immerſion, and that CHRIST, when he commanded to *baptize*, commanded to *immerſe* or plunge, for that, he ſays, is the Signification of the word: And now, after theſe Conceſſions, he and all thoſe who make ſo free with our LORD's Inſtitutions, as to pretend it is not neceſſary to perform them juſt as he has directed, ſhou'd conſider how they will be able to anſwer it, and whether it does not look a little too much like mocking him, when they deviate from what they know to be his Command.

Grotius, than whom no Man ever knew better, gives it on my ſide, in his Annotations on the ſame Place, *Mat.* iii. 6. * *That this Rite was wont to be perform'd by Immerſion, and not by Perfuſion, appears both by the Propriety of the Word, and the Places choſen for its Adminiſtration,* John iii. 23. Acts viii. 38. *and by the many Alluſions of the Apoſtles, which can't be refer'd to Sprinkling,* Rom. vi. 3, 4.

ὑπιπολάζειν, βαπτίζειν, δύναν. Unde intelligimus non eſſe abs re quod jampridem nonnulli diſputarunt de toto Corpore immergendo in Ceremonia Baptiſmi: Vocem enim βαπτίζειν urgebant. Sed horum Sententia meritò eſt jampridem exploſa, cùm non in ea poſita ſit Myſterii hujus vis & Ἐνέργεια.

* Merſatione autem non Perfuſione agi ſolitum hunc Ritum indicat & vocis Proprietas, & loca ad eum Ritum delecta, *Joh.* iii. 23. *Act.* viii. 38. & Alluſiones multæ Apoſtolorum, quæ ad Aſperſionem referri non poſſunt, *Rom.* vi. 3, 4.

3, 4. Col. ii. 12. *The Custom of Perfusion or Aspersion seems to have obtain'd some time after, in favour of such who lying dangerously ill were desirous to dedicate themselves to* CHRIST: *These were call'd* Clinics *by other Christians. See* Cyprian's *Epistle to* Magnus *to this purpose. Nor shou'd we wonder that the old* Latin *Fathers use* tingere *for* baptizare, *seeing the* Latin *word* tingo *does properly and generally signify the same as* mersare, to immerse or plunge.

To the same purpose speaks the celebrated *Dionysius Petavius*, giving Instances of the Church's Power to alter or impose: † *And indeed*, says he, *Immersion is properly stil'd* βαπτισμὸς, *tho at present we content our selves with pouring Water on the Head, which in* Greek *is call'd* περίχυσις, that is, *Perichysm*, if I may so anglicise, but not *Baptism.*

But why do I spend time in transcribing these Quotations, when there are such large Collections already, which render this Labour needless, and will make any modest Person blush, to say in general, that Criticks and learned Men allow of that pretended Sense of the word? Mr. *Stennett*, in his Answer to *Russen*, a Book Mr. *Wall* has seen, and I wish he had consider'd it more impartially, for then I'm satisfy'd he wou'd have laid by his Design, and there wou'd have been no occasion for

---

3, 4. *Col.* ii. 12. Seriùs aliquantò invaluisse videtur mos perfundendi sive aspergendi, in eorum Gratiam qui in gravi morbo cubantes nomen dare CHRISTO expetebant, quos cæteri κλινικὰς vocabant. Vide Epist. *Cypriani* ad *Magnum.* Quod autem *tingere* pro *baptizare* usurpant Latini veteres mirum videri non debet, cum latinè tingendi vox & propriè & plerumque idem valeat quod *mersare.* *Pag.* 103.

† *Dogmat. Theologic. lib.* 2. *de Pœnitentia, cap.* 1. §. 11. Ac sanè immersio propriè dicitur βαπτισμός, cum hodie satis habeamus aquam capiti affundere, quod Græce dicitur περίχυσις.

theſe Letters: Mr. *Stennett*, I ſay, has furniſh'd us with ſo many Inſtances, both Antient and Modern, of this nature, ſome of which are taken from the greateſt Men of the Church of *England* now living, or lately dead, that he makes the thing evident almoſt to Demonſtration; ſo that I'm in no fear of being contradicted by the Learned, who acknowledg all I plead for in this Caſe.

And indeed you may be pleas'd to obſerve, Sir, (tho Mr. *Wall* ventures, with ſuch an Air of Aſſurance, to affirm, || *'tis plainly a Miſtake* to ſay, that *baptize* means only *dip*, and that it appears to be ſo from the *Greek* Writers and Criticks, *&c.*) that he is certainly under ſome Apprehenſion on this Point, by his paſſing over this part of the Argument ſo willingly: And, which is ſomething ſtrange, and does not argue abundance of Ingenuity, Mr. *Wall*, you may remember, produces the Suffrages of ſeveral learned Men, and pleads ſtrongly himſelf for Immerſion, in the ninth Chapter of his Second Part, where he confeſſes Immerſion is the more regular and convenient manner, and moſt agreeable to the Example of CHRIST and the Primitive Church. But to qualify this Conceſſion, he adds indeed, that Immerſion is not ſo neceſſary to Baptiſm, but it may be adminiſter'd by Affuſion, *&c.* which looks to me like a Contradiction of what he allow'd before: for nothing certainly ſhou'd be done in this Caſe, but what is moſt regular and agreeable to the Practice of CHRIST and his Apoſtles; nothing ſhou'd be ordinarily practis'd now, which is not ſo well as what was ordinarily practis'd then.

But to leave this: Pray whence did Mr. *Wall* receive his Knowledg, that Baptiſm may be adminiſter'd by *Pouring*, &c? I have already large-

|| Part II. pag. 219.

ly, and, I think, beyond Contradiction, prov'd, that, with the *Greek* Authors, and other learned Men, the word is never us'd to ſignify *Pouring*, but always *Dipping*. But it ſeems our Author was aware of this, and therefore tells us, * *What the* Greek *Writers and Criticks*, &c. *ſay, is not much to the Purpoſe; for the Senſe of a Scripture-Word is not to be taken from them, but from the uſe of it in Scripture*: from whence he pretends it may be plainly determin'd to ſignify to *waſh* in general. But, notwithſtanding he takes the liberty to aſſert this, I hope to prove he is in an Error, and to fortify my Proofs from the conſtant uſe of the Word among the *Greeks*, with the Authority of the Scripture too; and to ſhew it was thus only that the Apoſtles and Primitive Chriſtians underſtood the Word, and practis'd this ſacred Ordinance.

In the Seventy's Tranſlation of the Old Teſtament, and the Apocrypha too, I can find but twenty five Places where the words occur, and in eighteen of 'em they do undoubtedly mean to *dip*, as you'll allow, if you read over the Verſes cited below †: For I don't think you are likely to make ſuch a trifling Remark on any Paſſage, as Mr. *Wall* has on *Lev.* xiv. 6. He was endeavouring, if you remember, to ſhew from the Old Teſtament, that the word does not neceſſarily ſignify *to dip*; and quotes this Place of *Leviticus*, than which nothing cou'd be more directly againſt him, and obſerves thus: ‖ *The word is* βάπτει, *and the*

---

* Part II. p. 219, 220.

† Exod. xii. 22. Lev. iv. 6, 17. Chap. ix. 9. Chap. xi. 32. Chap. vi. 16, 51. Numb. xix. 18. Deut. xxxiii. 24. Joſh. iii. 15. Ruth ii. 14. 1 Kings xiv. 27. & 2 Kings v. 14. Chap. viii. 15. Job ix. 31. Pſal. lxviii. 23. Judith xii. 8.

‖ Part II. p. 221.

Engliſh

Engliſh dip, *yet it cannot be underſtood Dipping all over; for the Blood of the Bird in the Baſon cou'd not be enough to receive the living Bird and the Cedar Wood, and the Scarlet and the Hyſſop all into it.* Now ſuppoſing this to be true, how does it prove the word does not ſignify to *dip?* The moſt he can infer from it, is only that it does not always neceſſarily mean to *dip all over*; and he ſhou'd have been ſo juſt to his Readers, as not to have confounded this with Dipping in general: by this Stratagem making ſuch, as are willing to believe it, take this for a good plain Objection, and (becauſe it ſeems, as Mr. *Wall* repreſents the matter, not to mean that the living Bird, *&c.* were dip'd all over) to infer, the word in this Place does not ſignify to dip at all. This, if any thing, muſt be his meaning here. But if he wou'd not be ſo underſtood, 'twill be no eaſy thing to imagine what he can ſuppoſe the word does here ſignify. Undoubtedly he can't mean that the Bird, *&c.* were *pour'd* or *ſprinkled* into the Blood, or the like; and yet if he won't allow the word to ſignify to *dip*, he ought at leaſt to have told us what is the Signification of it, and not have left us wholly in the dark.

Farther, to go on ſtill with the Suppoſition that the living Bird, *&c.* cou'd not be *dip'd all over:* This does not affect our Diſpute, ſince we readily grant there may be ſuch Circumſtances in ſome Caſes, which neceſſarily and manifeſtly ſhew the thing ſpoken of is not ſaid to be dip'd all over; but it does not therefore follow that the word in that Place does not ſignify to dip, and I believe Mr. *Wall* will allow his Pen is dip'd in the Ink, tho it is not daub'd all over, or *totally immers'd.* So that, after all he ſays, it ſtill remains that the word does ſignify to *dip.*

Beſides;

Beſides; I can't ſee why it ſhou'd be thought impoſſible for the living Bird and the other things to be dip'd all over. 'Tis true, there appears ſome Difficulty in it upon Mr. *Wall*'s Suppoſition; but that is grounded on a very groſs Miſtake; for the order of Purification in the caſe of Leproſy was this, to take a quantity of Water in an earthen Baſon, out of a Fountain or running Stream, which in the remoteſt Times was always judg'd pureſt and moſt proper for their Purification; over this Veſſel of Fountain-Water they kill'd the Bird, ſo as to have the Blood run into the Water, and mix with it in the Baſon; and then the living Bird, the Hyſſop, *&c.* were dip'd into this Mixture, which might be capable of receiving 'em all, tho the Blood alone, as our Author ſays, was not. And ſince the Seventy tranſlate *Verſe* 6. and *Verſe* 51. in the ſame manner, *viz. over running Water*; and *Jonathan*'s *Targum* too tranſlates both in the ſame words, *viz. in Blood and in Water*, it's plain they underſtood the two *Hebrew* Phraſes to expreſs the ſame thing.

I might confirm this account of the thing by the Teſtimonys of the *Jewiſh* Doctors, if they were of any Authority; but as they are a very trifling ſort of Interpreters, of no Credit, and never to be depended on, I reject 'em, and argue only from the Reaſon of the thing, and the plain Import of the Words themſelves, compar'd with *Ver.* 51. where the dipping into the Water, as well as into the Blood, is mention'd, perhaps, more diſtinctly: but it is plain to Demonſtration, from *Heb.* ix. 19. *For when* Moſes *had ſpoken every Precept to all the People according to the Law, he took the Blood of Calves and of Goats, with Water, and ſcarlet Wool, and Hyſſop, and ſprinkled both the Book and all the People.* The utmoſt, I ſay, that cou'd be infer'd from this Paſſage, is only, that the Word

Word does not always neceſſarily imply a total Immerſion, or dipping the whole thing ſpoken of all over; which I readily allow: but then, Sir, we ſhou'd remember, 'tis not from any thing limiting the Senſe of βαπτίζω, but from ſomething limiting the Extent of the Action in the Subject, which directs us to apply the full Senſe of the Word to one particular thing, or perhaps to one part of a thing only; for a *Synecdoche* does not affect the Verb, but the Thing ſpoken of. Thus, to uſe the familiar Inſtance I mention'd before, we ſay, *dip the Pen*, meaning only the Nib of it, which we really dip into Ink: Tho the whole Pen is not dip'd all over, yet the Part particularly refer'd to, is, and the Pen may be truly ſaid to be dip'd; according to that known Rule, What is true of any one Part, may be ſaid of the Whole complexly, tho not of every Part of the Whole ſeparately.

Of the twenty-five Inſtances where the Word is us'd in the Old Teſtament and Apocrypha, eighteen, you ſee, Sir, are manifeſtly us'd to ſignify *to dip*. There wou'd be no need to mention the other ſeven that remain, after what has been ſaid, but that Mr. *Wall* inſinuates, and wou'd have it believ'd, that it may be abundantly prov'd from Scripture, that the Word does not always mean *to dip*. Theſe Places which ſtill remain, if there be any Difficulty in 'em, may be eaſily accounted for by what I have already ſaid on ſome Paſſages parallel to 'em: however, I muſt juſt mention 'em.

The Seventy have tranſlated *Iſaiah* xxi. 4. very looſly; and without any occaſion, uſe the Word in diſpute. The Senſe in the *Hebrew* runs thus: *My Heart has wander'd, and Horror has affrighten'd me*; but they have render'd it, *and Iniquity*, βαπτίζει, *overwhelms me*. The Senſe is obvious to thoſe who are acquainted with the Style of the Pro-

Prophets, which abounds with frequent Metaphors and Allusions. I have accounted for this manner of Speech already *, and shewn, that taking it for a kind of Simile, and supplying what is necessary to fill up the Sense, it rather proves, than makes any Objection against, what I plead for. Besides, as the Word here can't be understood to signify to *wash*, *pour*, or *sprinkle*, *&c.* I suppose no body will urge this place against me.

The Instance in *Ezekiel* xxv. 15. is manifestly an Argument on my side, if you consider what I said above on those Phrases which speak of *Dying*; and it may be noted that βαπτισθὰ here signifys dip'd, as much as does the *Hebrew* Word טבולם, which is translated by it; the Original signifying what our *English* Version here calls *dy'd Attire*; and every one must own טבל signifys only to *dip*.

I don't know whether you'll think *Dan.* iv. 33. and v. 21. more intricate than the preceding Instances: but becaus Mr. *Wall* has endeavour'd to defend himself by it, I must take a little the more notice of it. The same Word is us'd in both places, and on the same occasion, and therefore we may consider 'em as one Passage.

The Word here us'd in the Original is יצטבע, which in the *Chaldee* necessarily implys *dipping*; witness *Buxtorf*, *Castell*, &c. and above all, the constant use of the Word. 'Tis by this Word the *Jerusalem Targum* renders the *Hebrew* טבל, *Levit.* iv. 6. the only place where that imperfect Version translates the *Hebrew* Word; but had it been complete, we shou'd, probably, have had more Instances.

---

* *Page* 126, &c.

In

In other places where the Word is us'd, tho not to tranſlate טבל, it is always in the ſame Senſe, ſignifying to *immerſe* or *drown*; as *Exod.* xv. 4. in which place the *Jeruſalem Targum*, *Jonathan*'s Paraphraſe, and that call'd *Onkelos*, the *Syriac* Verſion, and the Original of *Moſes*, do all uſe טבע or טמע to ſignify *immerſe*, *plunge*, or *drown*, as our Verſion renders it: but I ſuppoſe it will not be queſtion'd, otherwiſe I wou'd attempt more largely to prove this Word does always properly ſignify *to dip*. To this Conſideration if it be added, that the Word by which the Seventy turn it into *Greek*, is alſo confeſs'd on all hands to have primarily and generally this Signification, there can be no Difficulty to determine the Senſe of the Word in this place. For ſince the *Greek* Word commonly and properly ſignifys *to dip*, and is put for a *Chaldee* one of undoubtedly the ſame Meaning, it muſt be very natural to judg that to be the true Senſe, and what the Writers here intended.

'Tis indeed us'd here metaphorically; as 'tis five times in theſe two Chapters, on this ſame occaſion: and therefore the Seventy render it once by κοιτάζεσθαι, *made to lie*; and twice, according to the vulgar Editions, by αυλίζεσθαι, *to lie all Night*, as Verſe 23, 25. tho ſome Copys, which ſeem to preſerve the antient true Reading, with *Theodoret*, tranſlate it literally in this laſt Verſe, by βαφήσεται, *ſhall be dip'd*; as the Seventy alſo have thought fit to do, Verſe 33. (the place which Mr. *Wall* quotes) and Chap. v. 21. retaining the Metaphor. Hence it ſeems very clear, that both *Daniel* and his Tranſlators deſign'd to expreſs the great Dew *Nebuchadnezzar* ſhou'd be expos'd to, more emphatically, by ſaying, he ſhou'd lie in Dew, and be cover'd with it all over, as if he had been *dip'd*: for that is ſo much like being dip'd,

as

as at most to differ no more than being in, and being put in; so that the Metaphor is very easy, and not in the least strain'd.

The Translators abundantly intimate, they thought this to be the true Sense of the place, by varying, as they have, the Word in their Version, which in the Original is but one: they turn it κοιτάζεσθαι, and αὐλίζεσθαι, to express his lying out in the open Air; and βάπτεσθαι, to signify he shou'd be as wet by it, as if he had been dip'd in Dew. But having said so much already, I will only add in passing, that the Dews in the East are generally very large, as appears from several Passages of Scripture, as well as from the Accounts of Travellers into those Parts. Therefore, in the Story of *Gideon*'s Fleece, you find, after it had been expos'd to the open Air all Night, he press'd out of it a *Bowl full of Water*, Judges vi. 38. And the holy Psalmist, setting forth the Advantages of Unity, compares it to the *Dew of Hermon, and the Dew that descended upon the Mountains of Zion*, *Psal.* cxxxiii. 3. And philosophically speaking, the hottest Climates and clearest Skys naturally abound most with Dew, which is also confirm'd by constant Experience. 'Tis commonly known to be so in her Majesty's Leeward-Islands in *America*; where one Season of the Year, when they have no Rains for a considerable time together, the Fruits of the Earth wou'd be burnt up, were it not for the Dews which fall plentifully in the Night. That incomparable Mathematician Capt. *Halley* observ'd, when making some Experiments in *St. Helena*, that the Dews fell in such abundance, as to make his Paper too wet to write on, and his Glasses unfit for use without frequent wiping. And as to *Africa* in particular, where part of *Nebuchadnezzar*'s Dominions lay, *Pliny* tells us, the Nights there were very

very dewy. *Egypt* has little or no Rain, but is fed by the overflowing of the *Nile*, and by conſtant nocturnal Dews: and *Nebuchadnezzar* kept his Court in a Country of near the ſame Latitude, and conſequently of the like Temperament.

It appears from hence, how properly the Sacred Writer has, on this occaſion, us'd a Word ſo emphatical and expreſſive, and avoided one that wou'd only have ſignify'd a moderate gentle wetting; for that had fall'n ſhort of the Truth, and not expreſs'd ſo fully as was neceſſary, the great quantity of Dew by which he was made *very* wet. This ſhews alſo how faulty thoſe Verſions are which take a Word too weak, and that does not by far reach the full Senſe.

The Authors of the antient and valuable *Syriac* Verſion, who were of the Neighbourhood of *Babylon*, and well enough acquainted with the large Dews in thoſe Parts, and endeavour'd to give an exact literal Tranſlation, have ſhun'd this Error: 'Tis worth our obſerving, that they render the Word there by ܫܒܰܥ, which from the *Hebrew* טבע, *to put into any thing*, as 1 *Sam.* xvii. 49. ſignifys to *immerſe* or *dip*, but never once, that I know of, to *waſh*, or *ſprinkle*, or ſimply to *wet*. And in theſe Verſes the ſame Word is always us'd in the ſame Senſe; which makes it very plain, how thoſe Interpreters underſtood it, and that they thought that manner of Expreſſion very proper and ſutable to the thing intended.

And now, from all theſe Conſiderations I think 'tis very plain, what is the true Senſe of this place, and that it makes nothing againſt me. For the Interpretation I give, is grounded on the certain allow'd general Senſe of the Words; is very agreeable to the Nature and common Uſe of Languages; and withal, exactly conformable to the Deſign of the Writer; and ſtrongly counte-

nanc'd

nanc'd by the original Word, and the best Translations: and nothing more than all this can be desir'd to justify any Interpretation whatever.

But after all, if notwithstanding what has been said, any can possibly judg this Sense of the place which I have given, not so necessary as I pretend, the Objection Mr. *Wall* raises from it, is however effectually enervated: For, if it is in it self so uncertain and obscure, as to afford no necessary Argument for my Opinion; he and all Men must however grant, they can draw no necessary Consequence from it against me. For it will be allow'd, that the Words are, at least, capable of my Exposition, without any Absurdity or Constraint at all. I have now but one Passage or two more to take notice of from the Old Testament and Apocrypha.

Ecclesiasticus xxxi. 30. but in the *English* 'tis ver. 26. *The Furnace proves the Edge in the tempering,* ἐν βαφῇ, *by dipping.* This is just like the first Quotation from *Homer*; and what I have said there may serve to illustrate this, especially if we add *Didymus*'s Note on that place, that * *Red hot Iron, by being dip'd into cold Water, becomes very hard.*

The Word is us'd again, 2 *Maccab.* i. 21. to signify *drawing Water*, viz. by *dipping* a Bucket, *&c.* And this Use of it I have largely consider'd before, and therefore shall need add but one Remark here, That 'tis necessary the Word shou'd signify to dip in this place, because the Water is said to be at the bottom of a deep Pit, *Ver.* 19. Now 'tis certain the Water cou'd not be drawn up, as our Translation reads it, without dipping the Vessel into it: so that the Force of the Word can't be

* Τὸ βάψαι ψυχρῷ τ πυρωθὲν σίδηρον. ἰσχυρὸν δ αὐτὸν ποιεῖ.

expreſs'd more exactly than by our *Engliſh* Phraſe, to *dip a Pail or Bucket of Water.*

But of all the Texts which can be produc'd, ſome think *Eccleſiaſticus* xxxiv. 26. the moſt conſiderable by far; and indeed they may give it a very plauſible Appearance. The Words are in our Tranſlation; *He that waſheth himſelf becauſe of a dead Body, and toucheth it again, what availeth his waſhing?* Βαπτιζόμενος is the Word; and 'tis here us'd to ſignify that waſhing which the Law enjoin'd upon all who had been defil'd by touching a dead Body. Now, the manner of Purification in ſuch Caſes, is thus deſcrib'd, *Numb.* xix. 18. *And a clean Perſon ſhall take Hyſſop, and dip it* (by the way, you may obſerve, the Word here is βάψει, and plainly ſignifys to *dip*, tho perhaps 'twas not dip'd all over, no more than our Author thinks the living Bird, *&c.* were, in an Inſtance we conſider'd before) *in the Water, and ſprinkle it upon the Tent*, &c. *and upon him that touch'd a Bone, or one ſlain, or one dead, or a Grave.* There are other Paſſages to the ſame purpoſe, which either mention this ſprinkling, or plainly enough allude to it; as *Verſe* 9. *And it* (viz. the Holy Water) *ſhall be kept for the Congregation of the Children of Iſrael, for a Sprinkling-Water.*

Theſe and ſuch-like other places, which make Sprinkling neceſſary, may ſeem to put the matter beyond diſpute; and I remember the time, when I thought this a very formidable Inſtance: but I ſoon found and corrected my Miſtake; and I think 'tis exceeding clear, to any who are willing to ſee it, that a farther waſhing is neceſſary beſides theſe ſprinklings, and that this waſhing was the finiſhing of the Ceremony. The defil'd Perſon was to be ſprinkl'd with the Holy Water on the third and on the ſeventh Day, only as preparatory to the great Purification which was

to be by waſhing the Body and Clothes on the ſeventh Day, with which the Uncleanneſs ended. Thus, *Numb.* xix. 19. 'tis ſaid expreſly, *And the clean Perſon ſhall ſprinkle upon the unclean on the third Day, and on the ſeventh Day: and on the ſeventh Day he ſhall purify himſelf, and waſh his Clothes, and bathe himſelf in Water, and ſhall be clean at Even.*

That the Word here us'd in the *Hebrew* is רחץ, can be no Objection; for beſides that 'tis ſaid, *Levit.* xv. 16. (tho not in the ſame particular Caſe) *Then he ſhall waſh all his Fleſh in Water*, the Word always includes *dipping*, and never ſignifys leſs. Thus 'tis us'd, in the Story of *Naaman*, 2 *Kings* v. more than once; and is explain'd, at laſt, by *Naaman*'s Action related *Verſe* 14. and by the Word טבל, which 'tis expreſs'd by in the *Hebrew*, and which the Seventy have render'd there by βαπτίζειν: and all this evidently ſhews, that *Naaman*, the Hiſtorian, and theſe Tranſlators, underſtood it to mean to waſh by dipping.

Some, indeed, are pleas'd to fancy, the Words which command bathing, are not ſpoken of the unclean Perſon who had touch'd the dead, but of the Prieſt officiating; and they fortify this Surmize by the 7th and 8th Verſes preceding, where the Prieſt is expreſly commanded *to waſh his Clothes, and bathe himſelf in Water.* But it does not follow, becauſe this place relates to the Prieſt, that the other does ſo too; nay rather, 'tis abſurd it ſhou'd, for it interrupts and confounds the Senſe of the place: beſides, in the very next Verſe but one, *viz.* 21. 'tis order'd, *that he who ſprinkles the Water of Separation, ſhall waſh his Clothes*, &c. plainly intimating, that was not the Deſign of the Words almoſt immediately foregoing. Beſides, it can't be reaſonably imagin'd, that the Prieſt by

barely purifying the unclean, ſhou'd need ſo much greater a Waſhing and Purification than the unclean himſelf.

This alſo, I think, will farther appear, by comparing this place with *Levit.* xi. 31, 32. which ſpeaks of the ſame thing, *viz.* of Pollution contracted by touching that which is dead; and ſays, the thing ſo polluted *muſt be put into Water.* And here it may be noted again by the way, that the Seventy have choſe βαφήσεται, as the moſt proper Word to comprehend the full Senſe of the *Hebrew* Phraſe יובא במים, than which (the Verb being in the Form they call *Hophal)* no Words can more ſtrictly and emphatically ſignify, *it ſhall be put into Water*; and therefore 'tis very ſurprizing to find that Dr. *Pocock* cou'd poſſibly ſuffer himſelf, on another occaſion, * to tranſlate theſe Words שיביא ידיו במים, *manus aquâ perfuderit*, directly contrary to the true obvious Senſe. I won't pretend to gueſs what cou'd move him to this, but I confeſs this rendring ſerves his Turn beſt. This is not wholly foreign to the Buſineſs in hand, tho it may be miſplac'd, and therefore I have juſt hinted it. But to return.

Theſe two Paſſages, I ſay, compar'd together, muſt be of conſiderable Force, ſince 'tis plain from 'em, that all Veſſels (except earthen, which were to be broken, *Levit.* xi. 33.) that had been polluted by the touch of a dead Body, were not only to be ſprinkled, as *Numb.* xix. 18. but they were alſo to be *put into the Water*, Levit. xi. 32.

Now ſince it can't be thought, the Perſon touching the dead was leſs defil'd than the Veſſels which touch'd the ſame, or were only in the Tent with it, or that he wanted a leſs degree of Purification; 'tis very natural, and I think neceſſary to under-

* Not. Miſcellan. *cap.* 9. *pag.* 388.

ſtand *Numb.* xix. 19. to be ſpoken of the unclean; who, I infer, therefore, was not only to be ſprinkled on the third and ſeventh Days, but was alſo to bathe, dip, and waſh himſelf in Water, as is plain too from *Numb.* xxxi. 21, *&c.* And if Dr. *Pocock*'s way of arguing from the *Mahometans* in ſuch Caſes as this, be good, the thing perhaps may be yet ſet in a ſtronger Light: for 'tis beyond queſtion, that they purify Perſons defil'd by the dead, by Immerſion and waſhing all over; as I might ſhew from the *Alcoran*, if it were at hand, and ſeveral other Writers. But inſtead of all, let this ſuffice, from the judicious *Compendium* of the *Mahometan* Religion, firſt publiſh'd from the Manuſcript by the ingenious Mr. *Reland* of *Utrecht*: The Author, ſpeaking of that kind of Purification by Water which they call'd *Gaſl*, in which, he ſays, the Water muſt touch * *every Hair of the Body, and the whole Skin all over*; tells us, this *manner of waſhing the whole Body is neceſſary in order to Purification after Circumciſion*, &c. *and in caſe of Pollution by the dead.*

And this, † *Strabo* informs us, was in uſe among the *Babylonians*; whether the *Jews* borrow'd it from them, or they from the *Jews*. And indeed, to the *Jews* this was the chief part of the Purification, and may alone be call'd ſimply the Purification; as the ſeventh Day is call'd the Day of Purification, or Cleanſing, *Numb.* ix. 6. becauſe the Purification was completed on that Day; or principally, becauſe then this Waſhing or Bathing, which was the great as well as the concluding part of the Purification, was perform'd; from which, as the principal part, that Day takes its Denomination. And by this, which was the chief

---

* *Pag.* 54. *l.* 1. † *Lib.* 16. *pag.* 1081.

part, is the whole Ceremony intended, *Levit.* xxii. 6. where 'tis ſaid of the Prieſts, particularly of *Aaron* and his Sons, they ſhall not eat of the holy things, after contracting any Uncleanneſs, *unleſs* they *waſh their Fleſh in Water*, i. e. purify themſelves regularly according to the Law. In which Caſe, the chief thing to be done, was to waſh their Fleſh in Water. And *Levit.* xi. 32. ſpeaking of putting the Veſſels into Water, it's ſaid, *ſo they ſhall be cleans'd.*

'Tis the ſame in other Caſes: As for Inſtance, in that of Leproſy, many things were requir'd for ſeveral Days, but the chief and moſt effectual on the Eighth; which is therefore call'd the Day of Cleanſing; and the Offerings are order'd to be brought *for his Cleanſing*, Levit. xiv. 23. as if the whole, or, at leaſt, the main Efficacy were aſcrib'd to them.

Theſe Conſiderations neceſſarily oblige us to believe, bathing and waſhing the whole Body in Water, was not only a neceſſary, but likewiſe a chief part of the Purification. And after all this, certainly there can remain no Difficulty in *Eccleſiaſticus* xxxiv. 26. For hence 'tis very plain, *Syracides* by καθιζόμενος in that place, means bath'd, dipp'd, and waſh'd; for you ſee, the Law requir'd no leſs, and no leſs was practis'd by the *Jews*, in caſe of ſuch Pollution by the dead. And 'tis eaſy to ſee the reaſon why he mentions, and more immediately refers to the bathing only, *viz.* becauſe, as I before noted, that was the chief part, upon which Cleanneſs immediately follow'd, all the reſt being only neceſſary Preparations.

And ſo we may find in many Inſtances, *Lev.* xv. and elſewhere, the waſhing only is expreſs'd, tho the *Holy Water* was likewiſe to be ſprinkl'd; for it was kept for a Water of Separation, and a Purification for Sin, *Numb.* xix. 9. and viii. 7.

And

And so the washing only is mention'd in this very Case of Pollution by a dead Body, *Levit.* xxii. 6. as before noted. And *Eleazar*, Numb. xxxi. 23. orders *all which abides not the Fire, ye shall make go thro the Water*; not adding, the Water of Separation was to be sprinkl'd on those things: tho he there intimates it must be sprinkl'd on the things which were to pass thro the Fire; and we are assur'd, from *Numb.* xix. 18. it was likewise to be sprinkl'd on the Vessels of Wood, *&c.* which cou'd not bear the Fire, but were to be wash'd, or put into the Water, *Levit.* xi. 32. But besides, 'tis usual, in speaking of the Whole, to mention a Part only; which may very well be thought the Case in hand, seeing 'tis prov'd that dipping was to be one part of the Ceremony; and 'tis allow'd by all, that the Word does almost constantly, and I think always, signify to *dip*, *plunge*, or *put into*. Which Considerations render the *Synecdoche* very easy; for thus the Word may be us'd to signify such a washing as includes *dipping*, notwithstanding sprinkling be also one part of the Purification: but then it does not so much express the sprinkling as the dipping, on account of which particularly the Word is apply'd to this Purification.

Thus I have now revis'd all that can be urg'd from the Old Testament, at least all that my own Observations and *Kircher*'s Industry have furnish'd me with; and, notwithstanding Mr. *Wall*'s needless Appeal to Scripture, have discover'd many undoubted Instances there, of the Sense of the Word, as us'd, in direct opposition to what Mr. *Wall* asserts: while no one Passage can be found to be on his side; at best, he can urge but two or three, which are very doubtful and obscure; and after all Improvements on 'em, conclude nothing. For whatever real or imaginary Difficultys

may appear in 'em, you ſee, Sir, I have fairly remov'd and accounted for 'em all.

Let us now, if you pleaſe, turn over the New Teſtament, and ſee what mighty Proofs that affords in our Adverſary's Favour.

In theſe moſt venerable Records, which are the unerring Rule of our holy Religion, the Word βαπτίζω is often us'd, but moſt commonly concerning the Baptiſm of *John*, or the Chriſtian Sacrament, which is the Subject of our Diſpute; but 'tis often without any Circumſtance which may determine how we muſt underſtand it: which, if it proves any thing at all, ſhews the Word is us'd in the common Senſe only, and according to the general Acceptation; for elſe it had been neceſſary to have appris'd us of the new and particular unuſual Senſe; and nothing of this being done, it ſeems reaſonable to give it the ſame Signification in all thoſe places as it has every where elſe. I think this is plain and undeniable; but Mr. *Wall* believes he can prove, by other Inſtances, that it does not, every where elſe, ſignify *to dip*.

To that purpoſe, he mentions only four, which he calls *plain Inſtances*; and to remove all imaginable Difficultys, I will omit none he might poſſibly have added, except ſuch as are plainly metaphorical, which therefore no Man can juſtly argue from, and they may all be very eaſily accounted for by what I have ſaid above.

The firſt, and which he enlarges moſt upon, is St. *Luke* xi. 38. which our *Engliſh* reads thus: *And when the Phariſee ſaw it, he marvelled that he had not firſt waſhed before Dinner.* The original Word, he notes, is ἐβαπτίσθη; and comparing this place with St. *Mark* vii. 5. which ſpeaks particularly of *waſhing of Hands*, he infers, this is *a plain Inſtance, that they us'd the Word* to baptize

for

for any ordinary Washing, whether there were dipping in the case or not.

To make this Conclusion pass more securely, he had insinuated before, that * *their way of that Washing was this: They had Servants to pour the Water on their Hands*, 2 Kings iii. 11. who pour'd Water on the Hands of *Elijah*, i. e. *who waited on him as a Servant.*

He says no more to prove this Custom, but thus slightly overpasses a Point which deserv'd and unavoidably requir'd greater Examination, considering the whole Stress of his Argument depends entirely upon it; for, if they wash'd their Hands, as we usually do now, by dipping 'em into the Water, no body need be told his Instance turns against him, and makes considerably for us.

To shew then, how little Service this does him, give me leave to remark these things to you: In the first place, There is a vast Distance of Time between the Period refer'd to in the Book of *Kings*, and our SAVIOUR's Time; and the Words he cites, at most do but discover what was the Custom near a thousand Years before, and signify nothing to the Time when the Words, which are the Ground of his Inference, were spoken.

And who does not know what great Alterations might happen, or rather must have happen'd in such a Succession of Years? The great Revolutions in the States and Kingdoms of the World sufficiently shew the Power of Time; a Multitude of Examples of this kind may be found in all, and even in our own Nation. But not to mention any of those Customs, which once universally prevail'd among the antient *Britains*, and are now quite worn out, I will instance in Baptism it self, which all Men know was us'd to be administred in *England* by Dipping till Queen *Elizabeth*'s Time, since which,

* Part II. p. 220.

that

that pure Primitive manner is grown into a total Diſuſe, within little more than 100 Years; and Sprinkling, the moſt oppoſite to it imaginable, introduc'd in its ſtead. The Matter of Fact is notorious, or otherwiſe, I think, it might ſeem much more incredible, than to ſuppoſe a People who once waſh'd their Hands by having Water pour'd on 'em, cou'd poſſibly 1000 Years afterwards, inſtead of this, waſh 'em as we do now, by dipping 'em into the Water: Eſpecially, conſidering how often they had been conquer'd, led into captivity and diſpers'd, and were even then actually under the *Roman* Yoke; for ſuch Revolutions always bring great Changes in the Cuſtoms and Humours of a People, along with 'em: and the *Jews* had actually ſo chang'd their Language in *Nehemiah*'s Days, that they did not underſtand the Scriptures in the *Hebrew* Tongue. Add to this, that CHRIST himſelf has aſſur'd us, they were an obſtinate, bigotted Race of Men, *a ſtiff-neck'd Generation*, as their Prophets ſtil'd 'em; and tho they valued themſelves extremely on their Law, yet our SAVIOUR aſſures us likewiſe, that they had introduc'd abundance of Innovations in their Religion, ſo far as to deſtroy its Eſſence, and vacate the grand Points of that very Law they were ſo proud of; and that particularly in the Waſhings it preſcrib'd: and yet this is certainly much harder to conceive them capable of doing, than that they ſhou'd make an Alteration in the Manner of waſhing their Hands. But Secondly,

I obſerve the Words don't prove what Mr. *Wall* cites 'em for: As our Tranſlation reads 'em, they appear, indeed, to countenance his Suppoſition, that about *Elijah*'s Time they might perhaps waſh their Hands after that manner; but if you read the Original, Sir, you will allow the Place might be altogether as well rendred, *who pour'd out Water* for, not upon, *the Hands of* Elijah; the *Hebrew*

brew Particle על often signifying *for*, in this sense, as *Psalm* xxxii. 6. על זאת, *for this Cause shall every one that is godly pray to thee*, &c. And thus it is us'd very frequently, as in all those numerous Instances where 'tis join'd with כן; so for Example, *Gen.* ii. 24. על—כן, ἕνεκεν τούτου, according to the Seventy: and perhaps our LORD from them, *Matth.* xix. 5. *For this Cause*, say our Translators, *shall a Man leave Father and Mother*, &c. So again, *Gen.* xi. 9. על—כן, διὰ τοῦτο; for this Cause, or, *therefore is the Name of it call'd Babel.* And once more for all, *Prov.* xxviii. 21. על—פת—לחם, in our Translation, *for a Piece of Bread, that Man will transgress.*

'Tis plain from these Instances, without adding any more, that the Words naturally admit a different Sense from what Mr. *Wall* wou'd fix on 'em, and therefore can avail him nothing. But,

Lastly, If 'tis worth while to enquire what was the Custom so long ago, in a Matter of this nature, 'twill with little search appear at least very probable, that their religious Washing of their Hands and Feet was perform'd by dipping 'em into the Water. For when *Moses* receiv'd directions from GOD concerning the Utensils of the Tabernacle, he was commanded, among other things, to make a Laver of Brass, in which Water was to be kept between the Tabernacle of the Congregation and the Altar, for the Priests to wash their Hands and Feet before they enter'd the Tabernacle, or when they approach'd the Altar to offer; *so they shall wash their Hands and Feet that they die not*, Exod. xxx. 21. The Word here us'd by the sacred Penman, in the Original is רחצ; which, as I before noted, generally, and I think always, includes dipping in its signification, and therefore too makes it at least probable, they were to wash their Hands and Feet by dipping 'em into the Water. Had יצק been us'd here, as in

2 *Kings*

2 *Kings* iv. 3. above-cited, which ſignifies to *pour*, Mr. *Wall* wou'd ſcarce have omitted this Paſſage, but have thought it very convincing and ſtrong on his ſide, as now, I think, it muſt be allow'd to be againſt him.

The ſame Word, we may obſerve, is us'd 2 *Chron.* iv. 6. about the vaſt Brazen Sea, *Solomon* caus'd to be made, which held 200 Baths, that is, near 1000 Barrels of Water: the Bulk of it argues, the Prieſts were to go into it; the Words expreſs it alſo, *the Sea was for the Prieſts to waſh in* בו. So again, in another inſtance, *Exod.* xxix. 4. concerning the Conſecration of the Prieſts, which *Jonathan* renders טבל, thou ſhalt *dip* 'em in 40 Meaſures of Spring Water.

Farther: That this was the Way our LORD took, when he waſh'd his Diſciples Feet, *John* xiii. 5. ſeems very certain, both from the Propriety of the Words, and the Manner in which 'tis related: *After that, he pours Water into a Baſon, and began to waſh the Diſciples Feet*, &c. We ſee the Water was not pour'd on their Feet, but into the Baſon, before he came to 'em, where their Feet were to be waſh'd. The Book that goes under the Name of the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, relates the Action thus: * *After that, he pour'd Water into a Baſon, and as we ſat, he came to us, and waſh'd our Feet, and wip'd 'em with a Towel.* The Baſon here is νιπτῆρ, which ſignifies a Veſſel to waſh in; from whence it has its Name, as the Water they waſh'd with, was alſo from thence call'd νίμμα, νίπτρον, ποδονιπτρον, or χειρόνιπτρον, and the like; and ſo *Euſtathius* † upon *Homer*, explains χέρνιβα, to mean *the Water which is pour'd*

* Lib. 3. c. 19. Ειτα βάλλει ὕδωρ εἰς τ νιπτῆρα· καὶ ἡμῶν ἀνακειμένων ἐπελθὼν, πάντων ἡμῶν ἕνιψε τὸς πόδας, καὶ τῷ λεντίῳ ἐξέμαξε.

† Pag. 1401. Χέρνιβα δὲ τὰ εἰς χεῖρας νίμμα καλαχεόμενα.

out

out for, not upon, *the Hands*; by which their Cuſtom, as well as the Senſe of the Words, is expreſs'd. And to all this we may add, that *Mark* vii. 3. *unleſs they waſh*, πυγμῇ, *up to the Elbow* or *Wriſt*, muſt imply *dipping*. But, beſides what our Author had ſaid himſelf to ſupport his Opinion, he refers us alſo, in his Margin, to Dr. *Pocock*, who he ſays, *has largely prov'd*, in his Not. Miſcell. *from* Maimonides, *and others*, *that this was the* Jews *way*; and then, not very fairly adds a Piece of a Sentence, which wou'd make any one think the Doctor meant that the *Jews* never waſh'd but by Affuſion, which ſeems not a fair way of dealing with the Authority he cites in his Defence; or does he think none have read the Doctor's Writings but himſelf?

That Learned Gentleman, I know, has taken a World of Labour to explain ſeveral Particulars relating to the Waſhing of Hands, according to the Sentiments of the *Jewiſh* Doctors; and has ſhewn himſelf very well vers'd in the *Rabbinical* Writings, which he underſtood, perhaps, as well as ever *Maimonides* did. But really, Sir, I ſhou'd have honour'd his Parts and Learning much more, if he had truſted leſs to thoſe fanciful Authors the *Rabbies*, whoſe Commentarys are frivolous and impertinent; and, in ſhort, 'tis impoſſible to erect a firm Building on ſo uncertain a Foundation. As for *Maimonides*, whoſe Authority, Mr. *Wall* is careful to inform us, is us'd by Dr. *Pocock* in this Affair, perhaps, to intimate that the Matter is therefore grounded on unexceptionable Evidence; I confeſs, he was one of the greateſt and moſt judicious that ever appear'd among the *Rabbins*, but a true *Rabbin* notwithſtanding, and perfectly beſotted to the idle Dreams, in which their boaſted Knowledg chiefly conſiſts; and conſequently, even He cannot be much depended on: Beſides, he liv'd not above 600 Years

Years ago, that is, about || 1100 after CHRIST, and therefore cou'd know what was practis'd in our SAVIOUR's Time no better than many can now; and yet he is, by far, the beſt Authority of any Dr. *Pocock* makes uſe of.

I wou'd not be thought to ſlight the Teſtimony of the *Rabbins* thus, becauſe they are againſt me in this Point, or that I'm ſo hamper'd with what the Doctor ſays, that I can anſwer no other way but by leſſening their Credit; for neither they nor the Doctor are ſo much againſt me as Mr. *Wall* pretends: beſides, they have not this Character from me alone, but from all who are acquainted with 'em, even thoſe Perſons that follow and depend on 'em ſo much, which is ſomething ſtrange. But I ſhall have occaſion to ſay more of 'em in another Place, where I may give ſome Reaſons for my Opinion.

But becauſe our Author refers, not ſo much to the *Rabbins* themſelves as to Dr. *Pocock*, a Man of very great Reputation, eſpecially for his Skill in theſe things; in deference to him, I will take notice of a Line or two in the Chapter Mr. *Wall* has cited; which may diſcover how much he abuſes the Doctor, who very fully grants all I need deſire: for he allows βαπτίζεσθαι ſignifys more than χερνίπτειν, *to waſh the Hands*; ſo that βαπτίζεσθαι muſt ſignify more than barely any Manner of waſhing 'em, and he can mean no leſs than to dip 'em: For his * Words are; *Theſe things abundantly confirm what I aſſerted in the Beginning*, viz. *that* טבל *(which anſwers to* βαπτίζεσθαι *in the* Greek*) ſignifys a farther Degree of*

|| R. David Ganz.

* Not. Miſcell. cap. 9. pag. 393. In his quæ produximus eſt quod ea quæ initio diximus abunde confirmet, eſſe ſcil. טבל (quod βαπτίζεσθαι ſignificat) ulteriorem purgationis gradum quam is qui per נטל ſeu χερνίπτειν intelligitur,

Purification, than טבל, *or* χερνίπτειν, *yet not so necessarily to imply an Immersion of the whole body; for the greatest and most notorious Uncleanness of the Hands reach'd but to the* Perek, *or the Wrist, and was cleans'd by immersing or dipping 'em so high.*

How different is this from our Author's Representation of the Doctor's Opinion, that the Jews *do not wash their Hands, but by having Water pour'd on 'em?* Whereas, you see, the Doctor says, he has been *abundantly* proving, that טבל or βαπτίζεσθαι does signify more than simply to wash the Hands; and the following Lines, wherein he explains what he means by *more than* χερνίπτειν, show clearly that he means to immerse or dip, as appears by the Instance, and the express Words he makes use of: And therefore also assigning the reason why βαπτίζεσθαι is us'd, *Mark* vii. 4. he recurs to this Custom of dipping their Hands into the Water, from which alone, he thinks, the expression is to be justify'd; intimating, or rather asserting, that the Word is us'd there and in the parallel Places, with a particular regard to that Practice. So Dr. *Hammond* understands it, and determines this to be the Sense of the Place too; for he says, the Word signifys the *Washing of any Part, as the Hands here, by way of Immersion in Water, as that is oppos'd to Affusion or pouring Water on them.* But Dr. *Pocock*'s Words are these:

† *I'll give you my Opinion: for their common ordinary*

---

ligitur, nec tamen totius corporis Mersationem necessariò digitare, cum vel gravissima ac manifestissima manuum mundities ת Perek, seu eâ quæ ad Brachiale est junctu- finiatur, & manuum eousque Mersatione tollatur, &c.

* Annot. in *Mark* vii. 4.

† Not. Miscell. c. 9. p. 397. Dicam quod sentio; cibum dinarium capturis liberum erat sive manus Aquarum justæ ensuræ conceptaculum, vel fontem immergere, sive eas- dem

nary Meals, they were at liberty, either to immerse or dip their Hands in a Spring, or a Baſon which held a certain quantity of Water, or to waſh 'em in the manner I deſcrib'd, by pouring Water on 'em. Since then they might waſh which of theſe ways they pleas'd, and 'tis likely enough ſome who pretended to a more than ordinary Sanctity, &c.—— might chuſe that which was reckon'd the chief; 'tis not without great reaſon, that a Word is us'd which ſhou'd comprehend both ways: for tho βαπτίζεσθαι *does indeed principally agree to the Immerſion, yet that it does not neceſſarily and only ſignify that, I think is plain from* Luke xi. 38. I add theſe laſt Words, becauſe in them the Doctor ſeems to declare againſt me, by inſtancing in the Place under conſideration, to prove that βαπτίζω does not always mean to *dip*. But,

Firſt, 'Tis no good Argument, but downright begging the Queſtion, to inſtance in the very Caſe diſputed. And Secondly, The Doctor having, juſt before, allow'd that the *Jews* did waſh by Dipping as well as by Affuſion, and that the Word does properly and principally ſignify ſuch a waſhing as is perform'd by Dipping, and withal accounting from theſe Conſiderations for the Uſe of it in *Mark* vii. 4. which is parallel to this in *Luke* xi. 38. it appears not only reaſonable but neceſſary to underſtand the Doctor's Meaning to be, that the Word does not *neceſſarily and only* ſignify to *dip*; for ſo his Senſe is conſiſtent

---

dem eo quem deſcripſimus modo Aquâ affusâ lavare: Cum ergo utram mallent harum lotionum adhibere poſſent, & ſatis probabile ſit ex iis qui majorem ſanctimoniæ ſpeciem præ ſe ferrent, fuiſſe qui, &c.—— eam quæ graviſſima putabatur obſervarent, non ſine magna ratione uſurpatum videatur verbum quod utramque comprehenderet. Nam quamvis βαπτίζεσθαι ei revera, quæ immerſione fit præcipuè competat, non tamen de ea ſolum, vel neceſſario dici patere arbitror ex illo. Quod occurrit *Luc.* xi. v. 38.

with

with what he had said before, and is indeed all he intended to prove by it: tho, at the same time, I must say again, even this is but begging the Question.

Thus much then may be fairly gather'd from the Doctor's Words, that in *Luke* xi. 38. and *Mark* vii. 4. βαπτίζεσθαι does naturally, *and principally*, signify to wash the Hands by Dipping; which is all I desire, and directly contrary to what Mr. *Wall* cites him for. He supposes, indeed, that 'tis us'd to comprehend the other way of Washing too; but this is an arbitrary Supposition, which seems to be made only to serve a Turn: nor does he so much as go about to prove the Word is ever once us'd so; the only reason he has to think it, are the Sayings of the *Rabbins*. But I wonder a Man of the Doctor's Parts shou'd (contrary to what he granted was the proper and general, and I add the constant Use of the Word) wrest and strain the sacred Text, to make it comply with the senseless Fancys of those chimerical Men.

In fine; what the Doctor says from the *Rabbins*, we see, is of no great Weight; and if it were ever so considerable, yet it makes nothing for Mr. *Wall*, but rather against him. For since 'tis beyond dispute, that the Word properly and generally signifys to *dip*; and that the *Jews* did, at least, sometimes wash by Dipping; and that Dipping also was thought a more perfect Purification, which therefore, at least, some of the superstitious *Pharisees* very strictly adher'd to: 'tis very natural, and even necessary, to believe the Word means nothing less in the Place before us, especially if it be consider'd, 'tis a zealous *Pharisee* who is there speaking, who also, perhaps, look'd for Signs of the severest Sanctity in a Person who set up for a Censor and Re-

former even of the Sect of the *Phariſees* themſelves; who made ſuch mighty Pretences to, and had gain'd ſo great a Reputation for Holineſs, *&c.* Add to all this, that if any heed is to be given to Words themſelves, the plain Letter of the Holy Text, which implys to *dip*, is on my ſide; while, on the contrary, Mr. *Wall* produces no one thing to make it probable, in the leaſt degree, that the *Phariſee*, or if you pleaſe St. *Luke*, did not mean to *dip*.

But I have run too great a length on this Paſſage; and will therefore endeavour to contract on thoſe which remain.

The next Inſtance Mr. *Wall* makes uſe of is *Mark* vii. 4. which he brings as an undoubted Proof for his Purpoſe: and, as if it needed or was capable of no Improvement, he only remarks, that *what is tranſlated the* Waſhing of Pots, *&c. is in the Original* the Baptizing of Pots, *&c. And what is there ſaid*, when they come from Market, except they waſh they eat not, *the Words of St.* Mark *are*, except they be baptiz'd, they eat not. Profound Obſervations! Any Man of a different Diſpoſition from Mr. *Wall*, wou'd have taken this for a very clear Inſtance againſt him; or to be ſure no other Man could have cited theſe Words, but he would at leaſt have thought it neceſſary to ſay ſomething however, to ſhew which way they ſo ſtrangely and wonderfully prove βαπτίζω does not ſignify to *dip*. I can't but wonder what it is Mr. *Wall* means; for, as to the Veſſels, if we know any thing of the matter, they were to be cleans'd by *putting 'em into the Water*, at leaſt if we may take the expreſs Word of GOD for it, *Lev.* ii. 32. And Dr. *Hammond* ſays, ‖ *The* Baptiſm *of* Cups *is*

‖ Annot. in *Mark* vii. 4.

putting

putting into Water all over, rinsing them. And as to the Persons, whether they wash'd by *dipping*, and whether they wash'd all over, or some part only, deserv'd to have been a little more enlarg'd on; but why do I say a little more, when he has said nothing at all to it, but has taken it for granted, without the least hesitation? as if it was a self-evident first Principle, that 'tis very direct and strong in his favour, notwithstanding he has allow'd that the *Jews* did immerse the Thing or Person to be wash'd *.

And here again our Author refers you to his Margin, to one Line or not so much, which he has transcrib'd from Dr. *Pocock*, in these words; † *They who wash'd at coming from the Market, did not dip their whole Bodys:* Which Words Mr. *Wall* brings in with a very magisterial Air in these terms, *This was not dipping.* But, by his and the Doctor's leave, 'tis a Mistake: for they, when they came from Market, did wash by dipping; and these dogmatical Assertions won't be thought to go a great way to prove the contrary.

The Doctor, indeed, sets himself with all his might to justify his Opinion; and to that end calls in the whole Body of *Rabbins* to his assistance, such as it is, light and inconsiderable enough in reason; but never attempts, as I remember, to give one Instance that the Word is so us'd as he pretends: which, nevertheless, would have carry'd something more of solidity in it, than thus to build all on the Authority of a thousand *Rabbins*, who make Reason and Revelation the least part of the Rule they speak by; and yet these Men only does the Doctor oppose to the universal

---

* Part II. pag. 324.

† Lavantes à foro totum corpus non merfabant. Misc. cap. 9.

Acceptation of the word, and the venerable Authority of the ſacred Text. What Reſpect can ſuch Perſons have to that awful Pillar and Ground of the Truth, who induſtriouſly make it bend and yield to the ſilly Whimſys of theſe Men? But againſt them and the Doctor I produce *Vatablus*, a Man ſo ſingularly vers'd in the Rabbinical Writings, that even the *Jews* themſelves, as Monſieur *de Thou* tells us, greatly admir'd his Lectures, and attended 'em when he was publick Hebrew Profeſſor at *Paris*. *Vatablus* ſays, † *They waſh'd themſelves all over*. And to paſs by others, I will only add the Authority of the admirable *Grotius*, who ought never to be nam'd without a Mark of Honour; he ſays on Mark vii. 4. ‖ *They were more ſollicitous to cleanſe themſelves from the Defilement they had contracted in the Market; and therefore they not only waſh'd their Hands, but immers'd their whole Body.*

Theſe Authoritys are vaſtly beyond Mr. *Wall's* Quotation, and proportionably determine the thing againſt him: but as conſiderable as they are, I don't deſire you ſhou'd truſt to theſe alone neither; for it will likewiſe appear that Antiquity, and, above all, the ſacred Text it ſelf contradicts him alſo.

That 'twas cuſtomary to purify themſelves by waſhing the whole Body, at leaſt in ſome Caſes, is ſhewn before; and the Prieſts were particularly forbid to eat, unleſs they firſt waſh'd their Fleſh in Water, *Lev.* xxii. 6. And we have frequent mention among the Antients of the *Hemerobaptiſtæ*, who were ſo call'd from their Practice of waſhing themſelves in this manner every day; as in the Apoſtolical

† Ad Marc. vii. 4. Se totos abluebant.

‖ Majori cura ſe purgabant a fori contactu, quippe non manus tantum lavando, ſed & Corpus merſando.

Conſti-

Conſtitutions †, where 'tis noted, that unleſs they're ſo waſh'd, *they eat not*; for without waſhing they thought they cou'd not be ſav'd, according to that Renunciation, tranſcrib'd by *Cotelerius* * from the *Regius Codex*, 1818. They are inſerted in the Catalogue of *Jewiſh* Sects by *Hegeſippus* ‖; and *Juſtin Martyr*, mentioning ſeveral Sects alſo of the *Jews*, names theſe among the reſt, and calls 'em ** *Baptiſtæ*, from this ſignification of the word: and theſe Waſhings are what in the *Conſtitutions* †† are intended by βαπτισμάτων καὶ ἡμερινῶν, *daily Waſhings*, as may be farther confirm'd by that account given us of one Sect of the *Jews* by *Joſephus* ‖‖, who liv'd in the Apoſtolical Times, and is of infinitely more Credit, and more to be rely'd on than all the Rabbins; he expreſly mentions, more than once, their Waſhing of their Bodys. *Tertullian* too plainly intimates, the *Jews* us'd to waſh their whole Bodys, when he ſays, *Tho the* Jews *daily waſh every part of the Body, yet they are never clean.* And Rabbi *Benjamin*, in his Itinerary (*) mentions the *Chuthites* or *Samaritans* about *Naploſa*, formerly *Sichem*, between *Gerazim* and *Ebal*; and ſays, they ſtill waſh their Bodys every day.

And what elſe but this waſhing of the whole Body can be the meaning of the ſacred Text, when 'tis ſo plain, and beyond all poſſible Ambiguity, that the Waſhing of the Hands is mention'd in the words immediately preceding, and

---

† Lib. 6. cap. 6. Ὅσινες καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν, ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν, &c.

* Ad Recognit. lin. 1. pag. 499.

‖ Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. 4. cap. 22. fol. 41.

** Dialog. cum Tryph. pag. 307.

†† Lib. 6. cap. 18.

‖‖ Bell. Judaic. lib. 2. cap. 7.

(*) Pag. 19.

 therefore

therefore can't, without great Abſurdity, be again ſo formally repeated here? If indeed the words in the 3d Verſe expreſs'd only a light waſhing of the Hands, it might then be feaſible enough to ſuppoſe, that in the 4th, St. *Mark* deſign'd to ſignify their extraordinary Care to waſh 'em more thorowly after they had been in the Market. But it is not ſo; for the 3d Verſe, 'tis generally agreed, expreſſes the greateſt and moſt ſolemn waſhing of the Hands, whether πυγμῇ ſignifies only *to the Wriſt*, as Dr. *Pocock*, *Hammond*, *Whitby*, &c. among our own Countrymen, think from the Rabbins; or (which ſeems moſt agreeable to the uſe of the word) *to the Elbow*, as *Theophylact* is commonly noted to explain it, and ſome of the beſt Criticks, as *Druſius*, *Cappel*, &c.

Can any one poſſibly imagine now, that juſt after ſaying, *the* Phariſees, *and all the* Jews, *except they waſh their Hands*, πυγμῇ, *up to the Wriſt*, or *Elbow*, *eat not*, *holding the Tradition of the Elders*; the Holy Evangeliſt ſhou'd immediately add, not only that they *always* waſh their Hands before they eat, but alſo *when they come from the Market*, *unleſs they waſh their Hands*, *they eat not*? This ſeems very mean and unneceſſary, for 'twas fully comprehended in the words immediately foregoing, and does not heighten or explain 'em at all. But to return to the Caſe in hand, if we underſtand it to mean the waſhing of the whole Body, the Senſe is pertinent, eaſy and natural, and very regularly expreſs'd too; for 'tis methodical enough to expreſs their common Purification firſt, and then to add, that in caſe of greater Pollution contracted at the Market, they were not content with barely this Waſhing, or any thing ſhort of waſhing the whole Body. *Albertus Bobovius*, chief Interpreter to the Emperor *Mahomet* IV. has follow'd this Order in a like Caſe, *viz.* in deſcrib-

ing

ing the *Mahometan* Washings, which they borrow'd from the *Jews*: First, he relates their ordinary Lustrations, *&c.* the washing of the Face, the Hands and Feet, *&c.* before Prayers; and afterwards adds, that upon greater and extraordinary Pollutions, they are oblig'd to wash the whole Body. And here by the way, if Dr. *Pocock*'s Method were good, we might improve this to our purpose, and shew, that in extraordinary Defilements, such as this in St. *Mark*, the *Jews* did wash the whole Body; for thus the Doctor frequently expounds the *Jewish* Ceremonys, by recurring to the *Mahometan*. But I think we don't need such Evidence.

But before I conclude what I have to say on this, give me leave to observe to you, that all the Versions in the Polyglot, except *Montanus*'s and the vulgar *Latin*, to wit, the *Syriac*, *Arabic*, *Ethiopic* and *Persic*, unanimously understand the words in a sense quite different from what has been hitherto mention'd; that is, they all take the meaning to be, not that the *Jews* wash'd themselves, or their Hands, *&c.* when they came from the Market, but that the Herbs, for instance, and other things they bought there, were first to be wash'd before they cou'd be eaten. Thus they translate the Place, *and what they buy in the Market, unless it be wash'd, they eat not.*

It must be own'd, the *Greek* is capable of this Sense; and I wonder Commentators have taken so little notice of it, especially since these four valuable Versions so intirely agree in it: for the *Syriac* and *Ethiopic* are allow'd to have been made in or near the Apostolic Times, and questionless by such as understood the *Jewish* Ceremonys very well, and perhaps were *Jews* themselves, as the greatest part of the Christian Church at that time was. I can't but pay very great Respect to such

antient Tranſlations, and therefore am willing to grant, this perhaps may be the true meaning.

Robert Stephens, in an antient Manuſcript from *Italy*, and the Copy *Beza* preſented to the Univerſity of *Cambridg*, read ὅταν ἔλθωσιν, *when they come*; and therefore our *Engliſh* Tranſlators have not put theſe words in the Supplemental Character: but *Grotius* thinks they were conjecturally added in the *Greek*, by ſome body who thought they were wanting; and *Lucas Brugenſis* ſays, they are inſerted from ſome faulty *Latin* Copys: The moſt and the beſt Copys omit 'em, and learned Men in general ſee no Neceſſity of inſerting 'em. But the Authority of theſe antient Verſions is, I had like to have ſaid, irreſiſtible, and ſhews that undoubtedly they were not in the *Autographa*, and the earlieſt Copys.

In ſhort, if the Senſe of the Words is as theſe Verſions take it, they are directly againſt Mr. *Wall*, for no body will make a queſtion how Herbs are waſh'd; and if this is not the Senſe, yet I think I have ſhewn plainly enough, that the *Jews* did ſometimes, and more than probably in the preſent Caſe, waſh the whole Body: or if after all neither of theſe Senſes will be allow'd, ſuppoſing the Place does ſpeak of waſhing the Hands, even Dr. *Pocock*, Dr. *Hammond*, &c. allow, and urge it too, that it means to waſh 'em by dipping, which anſwers my end full as well as either of the other ways; for if the word does but ſignify *to dip*, I ask no more, let it relate to the whole Body, or a Part of it only, either way I gain my Point.

The next Place our Author cites, will do him as little Service as any of thoſe we've already examin'd are found to do: 'Tis in *Heb.* ix. 10. *Which ſtood only in Meats and Drinks, and divers Waſhings and carnal Ordinances*, &c. Now of theſe

divers

divers Washings, βαπτισμοῖς, some, our Author tells us, were by Bathing, and others by Sprinkling; and so takes it for granted that the word in this Place signifies to wash in general, and any or all kinds of Washing, and to sprinkle as well as to dip.

But you may be pleas'd to observe, Sir, this is grosly begging the Question: For without any necessity, meeting with the word here, he supposes all the legal Sprinklings are intended by it, as well as the Bathings, and so learnedly demonstrates the thing; and then draws his Conclusion, that it signifys to sprinkle.

But the words, for ought he knows to the contrary, may speak of those Washings only which were by Bathing or Dipping into Water, and so *Grotius* and Dr. *Whitby* understand 'em. And therefore supposing the word principally to express Dipping, and not always or necessarily (if at all) to imply any thing else, which can't be deny'd me; and there being nothing in this Passage which makes it needful it shou'd include *Sprinkling*; it must seem very reasonable to suppose, it means only the Bathings: for there's not only no mention of Sprinkling, *&c.* or Allusion to it; but the word being allow'd generally and most properly to signify *to dip*, and here being no Intimation that any thing else is intended, 'tis something of an Argument to prove sprinkling is not intended.

While our Author endeavours to shew this *Greek* word does sometimes signify to sprinkle or wash, he shou'd certainly have made use of such Instances wherein *Sprinkling* is plainly meant; which, nevertheless, we see, Sir, he has not done.

Our Translators have render'd the Place before us well enough, one wou'd have thought, so as to have given our Author no reasonable ground of citing it to the purpose he does. But, it seems, there's

there's no being ſafe from the Cavils of ſome Men, and therefore I think it might have been render'd ſomething more determinately, *divers Bathings*, or *Dippings*. If it had been ſo render'd, I preſume Mr. *Wall* wou'd not have thought our Tranſlation did at all favour his Pretence; and yet the *Greek* is as expreſly againſt him as that cou'd have been: for I ſtill aſſert, the word does always, and here too, only ſignify *Dippings*, *Bathings*, &c. and unleſs he can aſſign a Reaſon to the contrary, the allow'd common ſettled Senſe of the word will be thought ſufficient to juſtify my Aſſertion. And, if it were nothing elſe, the bare Poſſibility of this being the true Senſe, will alone deſtroy all he ſays from the Words, which can have no force, till it is made appear they are capable of his Senſe only, and no other; for if they are equally capable in themſelves of either Senſe, they can argue nothing either way.

Our Tranſlators rendring the Original ſo looſly, perhaps gave Mr. *Wall* occaſion to imagine the *Greek* word is as general as the *Engliſh*; and therefore that the Text, ſpeaking of Waſhings in general, might be ſuppos'd to comprehend all the Waſhings of every kind (tho, by the way, it ſeems a little harſh to call Sprinkling, Waſhing) but he is to prove, and not to ſuppoſe, that the *Greek* is of ſo large a Signification. However, if we grant the ſacred Writer deſign'd by the words, all the *Jewiſh* Purifications by Sprinkling as well as by Dipping, it will no more follow, againſt the univerſal uſe of the word, that it here ſignifies to ſprinkle, than that *mucro*, for inſtance, in *Latin*, ſignifies the *Hilt of a Sword*, becauſe 'tis ſometimes put for a *Sword*, but ſtrictly ſignifies only the *Point* of it. So here; granting for once that Sprinklings are included in the Writer's Deſign, yet the word only ſignifies Dipping, and is put,

put, by a *Synecdoche a potiori*, to signify all their Purifications, this being one part of 'em: but 'tis no Consequence, that therefore the word signifies each Part singly, or that it belongs as properly to one Part as another, or that it ever signifies any of the other Parts, without or distinct from this of Dipping; which nevertheless, as absurd as it is, is our Author's Inference. Just as if, because *Cicero*, in one of his * Letters, calls his Wife and Daughter *Charissimæ Animæ*, some wonderful Critick shou'd thence pretend *Anima* in *Latin* signifies *Body* or Matter, as well as Mind or *Spirit*.

Tho the Tithing of *Mint*, *Anise* and *Cummin*, Mat. xxiii. 23. by a *Synecdoche*, denotes the whole Ceremonial Law, yet I suppose our Author won't go about to say, ἡδύοσμον, the Original word for *Mint*, signifies *Sacrifice*; and that ἄνηθον, *Anise*, is as properly a *Burnt-Offering*; and κύμινον, which is render'd *Cummin*, comprehends in its signification the holy Water of Separation, or the legal Sprinklings. In like manner *Circumcision* is frequently put for the whole Law, and so is *Sacrifice*; yet no Man can be so inconsiderate as to urge from thence, and insist on such Instances, to prove that either of these words signifies what the other does; and yet Mr. *Wall*'s Argument from this Passage is, at best, no other: For he supposes the words here are put for all the Washings, or rather all the Parts of the Purifications by Water; and thence concludes, the word signifies one as well as the other, Sprinkling as well as Dipping. And even this is grounded on a very false and precarious Supposition, *viz.* that the Original word is of as large an Acceptation as the *English* word by which 'tis render'd: But the *Greek* is as much a-

* Lib. 14. Famil. Epist. 14.

gainst

gainſt him, as what I count the more literal and truer *Engliſh*, viz. *Divers Bathings* or *Dippings*, wou'd be; for ſo it ſhou'd be tranſlated, which every one will ſay is quite oppoſite to his Suppotion; for *divers Bathings*, or *Dippings*, undoubtedly are not ſome Dippings and ſome Sprinklings. And this being agreeable to the true Senſe of the word, till I can ſee a good reaſon to the contrary, I muſt think this Place means nothing elſe.

The laſt Place Mr. *Wall* mentions, is *Mat.* xxvi. 23. *He that dips his Hand with me in the Diſh*, &c. and all the uſe he makes of it, is only to obſerve, the word does not here mean the Dipping of the whole Hand. But this is nothing to the purpoſe: For the Queſtion is not about the Whole, or a Part of the Subject, but whether the *Greek* word ſignifies only to dip, or any thing elſe. And therefore this is ſhuffling off the Queſtion, and ſeeming to ſay ſomething, when, in reality, he ſays nothing at all, but even by this tacitly allows all we demand. For, all other Conſiderations aſide, if it be true that βαπτίζω does only ſignify to *dip*, 'tis all we ask, and ſhall but deſire our Adverſarys ſo far to acknowledg the Truth, and our preſent Diſpute is at an end.

There is another Fancy of Mr. *Wall's*, which is almoſt too trifling to be taken notice of: he pretended to eſtabliſh the Senſe of the word from theſe two Particulars.

1. The plain Application of it in Scripture, to ſignify to waſh, by *Sprinkling* or *Pouring on* Water, and this we have been examining. 2. *That the Sacramental Waſhing is often in Scripture expreſt by other words beſides* baptizing; *which other words do ſignify Waſhing in the ordinary and general Senſe* *. The Truth of this Obſervation I ſhall not go about

* Part II. p. 221.

to

to question, I grant it is a plain Case; but what is this to the Business in hand? He is to shew βαπτίζω does signify any kind of Washing, and to that purpose he tells you, the Sacramental Washing is express'd by words which signify to wash in general; and what of that? Why here the force of this Argument, if it has any, must lie: The word which is sometimes us'd to express the Sacramental Washing, signifies any kind of Washing in general; therefore this Sacrament may be administer'd by any kind of Washing. And again, by another *therefore*, the word βαπτίζω, especially when apply'd to this Sacrament, must, if it agrees to the thing 'tis apply'd to, signify any manner of Washing too. To discover what admirable Logick this is, let us invert his Argument thus: βαπτίζω, 'tis plain, in all other Instances, signifies to *dip*, and not one Instance can be given where it ever signifies any thing else; therefore the Sacramental Washing, which is very commonly and indeed most properly express'd by it (for 'tis nam'd *Baptism*) was and is to be administer'd by Dipping only. And therefore,

2. All the other words, whatever they are, which are apply'd to this Sacrament, tho it were ῥαντίζω it self, ay, or even σμικρῶς καταῤῥαίνω, must signify nothing less than to dip likewise.

But the Unhappiness of this way of arguing is, that it will equally prove Contrarys true, and the same thing to be true and false, so that nothing will be gain'd by it: And thus it falls out with Mr. *Wall*; he proves by it that βαπτίζω signifies to *pour* or *sprinkle*, or any kind of Washing; and after the same manner I have prov'd that λούω, the word on which he grounds his Argument, and all the other words which he will say signify *to sprinkle*, &c. do always and necessarily signify to *dip*, and only to dip.

You

You ſee, therefore, this Form of Reaſoning concludes equally on both ſides, and conſequently in reality it proves nothing at all.

But if it be not a Fault to treat ſo ridiculous a Fancy more ſeriouſly, let me ask you, whether you can eaſily imagine that Mr. *Wall* is himſelf perſuaded there is any thing in what he ſays; for he muſt needs know well enough, that Words, like our Ideas, which they're the Signs of, muſt have their *Genera*, and their *Species:* Some are of a very large comprehenſive Notation; but the ſeveral things ſuch words comprehend, have beſides a more proper peculiar word to be diſtinguiſh'd by, which is not therefore of ſo large a ſignification. Take a familiar Example: we compaſſionately ſay, ſuch a Man is a poor Creature; but wou'd any one therefore imagine that the word *Man*, or *that particular Man*, and the word *Creature*, are ſynonymous Terms, equally large and comprehenſive in their ſignifications? Could any body be ſo abſurd as to infer, that the word *Man* ſignifies any created Being, an Angel, a Horſe, a Worm, a Stock, *&c*, becauſe the Generical word *Creature* comprehends, and is equally applicable to all theſe? Yet this is Mr. *Wall*'s own Argument to a tittle.

Thus, ſuppoſing βαπτισμοῖς, *Heb.* ix. 10. does, as he wou'd have it believ'd, ſignify any ſort of Waſhing, will it follow that the *Jewiſh* Sprinklings, which he ſays are meant there, may be perform'd by any kind of Waſhing; and that the words us'd in the Law for *ſprinkle*, ſignify ſo too? Or becauſe λάω, the ſame word he argues from here, expreſſes the legal Waſhings, will he ſay any kind of Waſhing might be us'd at liberty; and that 'twas enough to *ſprinkle* thoſe things which GOD directly commanded ſhould be *put into* the Water, *Lev.* xi. 32. or that יבא במים ſignifies

signifies to wash in general, and to sprinkle as well as any thing else, merely because the Washings are express'd sometimes by a general word, which comprehends all the kinds of 'em? 'Tis, I think, much more reasonable to say, that Words, to which common Use has appropriated a more particular Sense, shou'd be allow'd to determine what any others have express'd more generally and at large; the words of a more determinate Sense giving a more particular and exact account of the Matter. The General words may comprehend the Particular, not wholly, but only as they also signify to wash; for the latter mean something more than barely to wash, and restrain it to this or that manner of Washing. If it is but Washing, let it be Dipping or Pouring, or any thing else, it may well enough be express'd by the general word, tho this or that particular Mode of Washing can only answer the Import of the particular Word. Thus tho all Dipping is Washing, and as such is contain'd under the general word λόω, which signifies simply to wash; yet it does not therefore follow, that all Washing is Dipping, or that all Washings may be express'd by the word which properly signifies to dip; nor that, when two words are us'd concerning the same thing, as here λόω and βαπτίζω, they are ἰσοδύναμαι, and altogether of the same Import, as our Author wou'd strangely infer.

For thus * *Homer* speaks of Stars being *wash'd in the Sea*, using the same word Mr. *Wall* here argues from; and yet must be understood to mean, their setting in the Sea, according to the known Expression of the Poets. And therefore when *Virgil* is speaking of the greater and lesser *Bears*, and says,

* Iliad. E. v. 6.

They

They * ——————— *by Fate's Decree,*
Abhor to dive *beneath the Southern Sea:*

Tingo here, and βύνω in a thouſand Inſtances in the *Grecian* Poets, muſt be interpreted to mean any manner of Waſhing, and may as well ſignify *to ſprinkle*, as *to dip* or *put into.*

I need not repeat the Obſervations of Logicians about their *Genera* and *Species*; yet give me leave only to tranſcribe one Canon from *Ariſtotle: The* † Species *includes the Definition of the* Genus, *and all that is in it, but not* vice verſa. Dipping includes Waſhing, but Waſhing does not include Dipping; for there may be a Waſhing by Pouring, *&c.* Thus the Chriſtian Sacrament, which is to be adminiſter'd by Dipping, which is one kind of Waſhing, may very well be call'd by the general name [*Waſhing*;] but it will in no wiſe follow, that therefore this general word does not therefore comprehend all that is ſignify'd by the more particular one, or ſerve properly to interpret it.

Thus you ſee, Sir, how little there is in what our Author ſays, to make it plain that βαπτίζω does not neceſſarily and always ſignify *to dip.*

I hope I have acted very uprightly in examining all his Inſtances, and allow'd every thing its due weight, in his behalf. Beſides thoſe he mentions, I have likewiſe conſider'd all other Inſtances that I cou'd imagine might poſſibly be pleaded for him, which he took no notice of, without con-

---

* ——Perque duas in morem Fluminis Arctos,
Arctos Oceani metuentes æquore TINGI.
Georgic. lib. 1. *v.* 245.

† Top. lib. 4. cap. 1. Δῆλον δ' ἐστὶ τὰ μὲν εἴδη μετέχειν τῶν γενῶν· τὰ δὲ γένη, τῶν εἰδῶν οὔ.

cealing

cealing any one. And no Man, I fancy, will think there are others behind which may be urg'd with any Colour on his side; for such metaphorical Passages as *Mat.* xx. 22. *Are ye able,* &c. *to be baptiz'd with the Baptism that I am baptiz'd with?* and such like Places, are so manifestly figurative and obscure, that they can't be thought to furnish any Argument either way, and therefore I pass 'em by. And what I have farther to add upon this Matter, I must refer to my next. I am,

SIR,

Yours, *&c.*

LETTER V.

To appeal to the Scriptures only for the Senſe of a Word, very unreaſonable. 'Tis notwithſtanding prov'd from them that the Greek *Word muſt always ſignify to* dip. *What Paſſages may be argu'd from.* Luke xvi. 24. John xiii. 26. Rev. xix. 13. *The vulgar Copys have loſt the true Reading in the laſt. Metaphorical Paſſages make for, not againſt my Opinion. Languages don't exactly anſwer to one another. If the Word* βαπτίζω *were otherwiſe ever ſo ambiguous, yet as it relates to Baptiſm, 'tis ſufficiently determin'd only and neceſſarily to mean to* dip. *By the Doctrine and Practice of St.* John. *Of the Holy Apoſtles. Of the ſucceeding Church for many Centurys, which urg'd a trine* Immerſion. *Learned Men in general allow this Mode of Baptiſm. Mr.* Wall *pretends, tho the Antients did generally baptize by* Immerſion, *they likewiſe us'd* Affuſion, *or the like. But this was not allow'd in common Caſes. Aſperſion, how at firſt admitted. 'Tis unreaſonable to argue that the general Senſe of a Law, is the ſame with the Exceptions that are made to it. The antient Church of the firſt Centurys did not practiſe Affuſion,* &c. *St.* Cyprian's *Plea for Aſperſion very trifling. All who were baptiz'd in the Apoſtles times, were baptiz'd by Immerſion. The Clinical Affuſions don't appear to have been introduc'd till about* 250 *Years after* CHRIST: *At which time they very much doubted of their Validity. By the firſt Patrons granted to be only preſumptive. All allow Immerſion was inſiſted on antiently as the only regular way, in all common Caſes at leaſt. What to be thought of thoſe Perſons, who at the ſame time acknow-*

acknowledg this, and yet plead for what is ſo certainly and demonſtrably falſe on all accounts. An humble Remark on the Biſhop of Salisbury's *Plea for changing the manner of adminiſtring the Sacrament here in* England. *The Clergy pretend they wou'd gladly revive the antient Practice, but they don't take the proper Methods; and in reality obſtruct its being reviv'd.* Βαπτω *and* βαπτιζω *ſynonymous.*

SIR,

BY what I have already ſaid in my former, I believe, it ſufficiently appears, that there is nothing in the Scriptures which any way juſtifies Mr. *Wall*'s Suppoſition; and that whatever he has produc'd is of no Conſequence at all: But that you may ſee, Sir, how much reaſon we have to inſiſt upon it that the Word ſignifies only to *dip*, I wou'd add a farther Reflection on this Head before I diſmiſs it.

Our Author, that he may evade the Force of all that might be ſaid otherwiſe, appeals to the Scriptures concerning the Word, and will be determin'd by them only in this Queſtion; which is ſo unreaſonable a Fancy, that I admire any Gentleman of Underſtanding ſhou'd be guilty of it. For the moſt accurate *Greek* Writers, ſuch as the Poets, the Grammarians, *&c.* can undoubtedly give us the true Senſe of a *Greek* Word as well as the Scriptures themſelves, and are as much to be depended on in that reſpect: unleſs it be ſuppos'd the Scriptures have ſtrangely alter'd and wholly chang'd the *Greek* Tongue, and fram'd a Language to themſelves which wou'd unavoidably render them very obſcure and unintelligible, and ſo make them unfit for a Rule of Faith; becauſe this ſhou'd be plain and evident to the utmoſt that the nature of the thing will admit, eſpecially in the moſt eſſential Points. And ſuch an un-

affected Perſpicuity illuſtriouſly adorns the ſacred Oracles, whatever Mr. *Wall* may imagine to the contrary. But if our Author pleaſes, I will join iſſue with him here, and agree, that whatever ſhall be found to be the plain ſenſe of βαπτίζω in Scripture, that only ſhall paſs for the ſenſe of it in relation to the Caſe before us, the Sacrament of Baptiſm.

I have already gone thro all thoſe Places which can be produc'd from Scripture in favour of Mr. *Wall*'s Opinion, and abundantly prov'd from the Old Teſtament, that the Signification of the Word is always to *dip*. Let us now make as ſtrict a Scrutiny thro the New, and obſerve, ſince ſo plain Mr. *Wall*'s Senſe is not favour'd there, whether any thing appears in it for mine.

Almoſt all the Paſſages where the Word is us'd in the New Teſtament, relate to the Sacrament of Baptiſm, and therefore can be of no ſervice in our Inquiry; for the Queſtion is about the Senſe of it in thoſe Places. However, when 'tis accompany'd with any Circumſtances that may fix the Senſe, I ſhall think it fair enough to urge it on my ſide. All Metaphorical Paſſages alſo are out of doors, becauſe of their ambiguouſneſs and obſcurity; tho, if they prove either way, they are againſt Mr. *Wall:* And thoſe Paſſages which relate to the *Jewiſh* Waſhings, having been already examin'd; I will not repeat 'em, but go on to give you all the Inſtances that may be juſtly cited in this matter, and they are only theſe that follow, by which therefore the Senſe of the Word muſt be concluded.

I begin with *Luke* xvi. 24. which contains the rich *Epicurean*'s Prayer to *Abraham* in Heaven, to *ſend* Lazarus *that he may dip the Tip of his Finger in Water, and cool his Tongue.* The *Greek* is βάψῃ. And it can never be queſtion'd, without renouncing

common Sense, that 'tis well rendred in our Translation by *dip*. Another Instance as full and clear as this, is *John* xiii. 26. *He it is to whom I shall give a Sop when I have dip'd it; and when he had dip'd the Sop, he gave it to* Judas Iscariot. In the former part of the Verse 'tis βάπτας; but in the *Alexandrine* Manuscript ἐμβάπτας, as 'tis also in the latter part of this Verse, and in the parallel Places, *Matth.* xxvi. 23. *Mark* xiv. 20. It can no more be question'd what is the meaning of these Words in the Original, than what is the sense of the *English* Word *dip*, by which they are so properly translated.

'Tis trifling to enlarge on these, and therefore I go on. The next is *Rev.* xix. 13. *And he was cloth'd with a Vesture dip'd in Blood; and his Name is call'd the Word of* God. This Expression is so manifestly taken from the Dyers Art, that there can be no difficulty or uncertainty in it: for nothing can appear more natural than to understand St. *John* as representing the Person in his Vision to have been cloth'd with a Vesture which was dip'd [or as it were dip'd] in the Blood of his Enemys. But this I say only upon the supposition, that the vulgar *Greek* Copys retain the true Primitive Reading. There are several Reasons indeed, to make us think the contrary, and that the Word is chang'd; particularly the Authority of *Origen*, whose Writings are older than any Copys of the New Testament we can boast of; and therefore what he transcrib'd from Antienter Copys, must be more considerable than any we have. Now he, in his Commentary on St. *John*'s Gospel, || cites these Words from *ver.* 11. to *ver.* 16. inclusively, almost *verbatim*, as they are in our Editions; but reads ῥεραντισμένον *sprinkled*, instead of βεβαμμένον *dip'd*; which makes this

|| Pag. 51.

Paſſage nothing to our purpoſe. However, I ſhou'd not think this ſingle Authority of *Origen* ſufficient to juſtify my altering the Word; but I have likewiſe obſerv'd that the *Syriac* and *Æthiopic* Verſions, which for their Antiquity muſt be thought almoſt as valuable and authentick as the Original it ſelf, being made from Primitive Copys, in or very near the Times of the Apoſtles, and rendring the Paſſage by Words which ſignify to *ſprinkle*, muſt greatly confirm *Origen*'s Reading of the Place, and very ſtrongly argue, that he has preſerv'd the ſame Word which was in the *Autographa*. But beſides, if the latter Word ſtands, the Senſe is evidently what I aſſert.

Theſe are all the Inſtances I know of in the New Teſtament, where the Word is us'd according to the vulgar Application of it; but there are ſome, where 'tis apply'd to Baptiſm, that are conſiderably in my favour, and ſhall be taken notice of by and by. In the mean time, you ſee, Sir, our Author's Rule of interpreting a Scripture-Word, by its uſe in Scripture, is more to my Advantage than his; and certainly I have ſaid enough now to ſatisfy any Man in the World, who has the leaſt pretence to common Senſe and Reaſon, that the Word βαπτίζω does always without Exception ſignify only to *dip*. I have confirm'd this at large from the Writings of the *Greek* Authors, from the Opinion of the beſt Criticks, and from the conſtant Uſe of it in the Scriptures themſelves too; and ſince all confeſs this to be its general and moſt proper Signification, we ſhou'd never, without manifeſt neceſſity, depart from it. I believe I have given ſufficient Reaſons alſo, why Metaphorical Paſſages don't determine againſt me: for it no more follows from them that βαπτίζω does not ſignify to *dip*, than that *immergo* does not ſignify ſo, becauſe

because *Lactantius* for Example uses that *Latin* Word to signify being *given up* * to Wickedness: which Phrase he borrow'd perhaps from *Origen*, who uses the same exactly in his Commentary upon St. *John* †. Besides, this Metaphorical Use of the Word is very frequent among the Fathers, as well as among the profane Authors, as I observ'd before; for thus *Clemens Alexandrinus* says, ‖ *They who thro Drunkenness are dip'd in* (βαπτιζόμενοι εἰς ὕπνον) *or overwhelm'd with sleep.* The same sense *Virgil* thus emphatically expresses by a Word which properly signifys to *bury.*

**——————— *Their Forces join*
T' invade the Town, o'erwhelm'd *with Sleep and Wine.*

And *Clemens* in another Place, which is very remarkable, says, †† *And we who were once polluted with these things are now wash'd and cleans'd. But those who wash themselves in Intemperance, from Sobriety and a decent Behaviour, they immerse* (βαπτίζουσι) *dip into, or give themselves up to Fornication, judging it good to indulge themselves in Pleasure and Vices.* And *Gregorius Thaumaturgus* uses the Word much after the same manner, in this Passage of his Panegyrick upon *Origen* ‖‖‖; *And reaching his Hand to others, he delivers all, drawing 'em out* (*viz.* of the Difficultys, *&c.*) in which they

* Lib. 7. de Vita Beata, pag. 649. Vitiis immersi.

† Pag. 352. Τῶν πάνυ ὑπὸ τὴ κακίας καταβεβαπτισμένων.

‖ Pœdagog. Lib. 2. pag. 155. Ὑπνώδης γὰρ πᾶς, ὁ μὴ εἰς σοφίαν ἐξηγερῶν, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ μέθης βαπτιζόμενοι εἰς ὕπνον.

** Invadunt urbem somno vinoq; sepultam. *Æn.* 2. v. 265.

†† Strom. Lib. 3. p. 473. Καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲ ἀπλακήμεθα, οἱ ἐν τέτοις γενόμενοι. οἱ δὲ εἰς ταύτλω ἀπολέσαντες τὸ αἰσθέσθαι, ἐκ σωφροσύνης εἰς πορνείαν βαπτίζεσι, ταῖς ἡδοναῖς καὶ τῆς πάθεσι χαρίζεσθαι δόξαντίζοντες.

‖‖‖ Pag. 72. Ἄλλοις ὀρέγων χεῖρα διασώζοιτο ἅπαντα βαπτιζομένους ἀνιμώμενος.

are *as it were immers'd* (βαπτιζομένους) *overwhelm'd.* We may meet with ſeveral ſuch as theſe in Scripture alſo, as *Mark* x. 38. *Can ye drink of the Cup that I drink of? and be baptiz'd with the Baptiſm that I am baptiz'd with?* Luke iii. 16. *He ſhall baptize you with the* HOLY GHOST, *and with Fire.* Acts i. 5. *Ye ſhall be baptiz'd with the* HOLY GHOST, *not many days hence.* 1 Cor. x. 2. *And were all baptiz'd unto* Moſes *in the Cloud and in the Sea,* &c.

Can theſe or ſuch like Paſſages be thought ſufficient to juſtify any Man, in denying the Word ſignifys only to *dip?* So far from that, I am certain upon a fair Examination, it will evidently appear that the natural Signification of the Word is ſtill the ſame even in theſe Figures; for the whole Vigour and Energy of 'em depends upon it. To argue it does not ſignify to *dip* from theſe Paſſages, wou'd be juſt as ridiculous as if becauſe πίνω is us'd figuratively, *Mark* x. 37. therefore any one ſhou'd pretend it does not ſignify to *drink*; or again, that βυθίζω does not ſignify to *ſink, overwhelm* or *drown*, becauſe in that Ellyptical Sentence, 1 *Tim.* vi. 9. *which drown Men in Deſtruction and Perdition*, as the Words ſtand, it can't be literally true: but tho theſe Words here, and all Words ſome time or other, are thus metaphorically us'd, they have ſtill one fix'd conſtant Senſe annex'd to 'em.

There is another thing, which perhaps may give ſome Umbrage; I mean, that poſſibly in ſome Caſes, the *Greek* Word can't be ſo well render'd into *Engliſh* agreeably with our Idiom, by any other word than to *wet* or *waſh.* But no body can reaſonably from hence infer that the *Greek* is of as general a Signification as the *Engliſh*, by which it's render'd, and ſtands for any kind of wetting or waſhing. There are no two Languages which

which so exactly answer as to have no particular Word in the one, but the other is provided with a Term which signifies neither more nor less, to translate it by. Few People of the same Country couple the same complex Ideas to the same Word, as is evident by most Controversys, which have no other Original; much more therefore may two several Nations, different in Manners and Time, be suppos'd not to have equivalent Words to express a complex Idea unvary'd. Thus *navigo*, in *Latin*, will be very often translated into *English*, *go*, better than by any other Word we use; as, *in Galliam aut Belgium navigare*, *to go to* France *or* Holland. But it can't be argu'd therefore, that *navigo* is of an indeterminate Sense, and may equally mean to go either on Foot or Horseback, by Coach or by Water; for it always necessarily signifys the last manner of going, and never any other. Again, *Suspicionem movere*, is literally to *move suspicion*; and in more proper *English*, *to give umbrage*. But no Man in his wits will go about to argue from hence, that *movere* signifys in general to *give*; and that *Hæredes movere*, which is, *to expel the Heirs*, may be translated, *to give Heirs*: For tho, in both Phrases, *movere* means the same thing in it self, namely to *move*; yet it must be render'd into *English* by Words contrary to one another, *viz.* to *give*, and to *expel*. And the Reason is, that the Sense of it must be accommodated to the Subject 'tis apply'd to, and understood accordingly. And tho it strictly signifys to *move*, yet as it is join'd with other Words, it must be differently turn'd; for the same Action produces different Effects according to the Subject it acts upon. Thus when *movere* is join'd with *suspicionem*, it signifys *to move, give motion and action to Suspicions, to set things in a Ferment, and cause 'em to work in the Mind*. But tho the Word here pro-

properly enough ſignifys to *move*, this Senſe can't be better expreſs'd in *Engliſh* than by the Words I before made uſe of, *viz.* to *give* Umbrage. But then when theſe two Words, *Hæredes movere*, are join'd together, the ſame Senſe of the Word expreſſes the ſame Action and Motion, which yet has a different influence on the Subject: for to move an Heir is to put him aſide out of the way, from the Poſſeſſion of his Inheritance; for theſe words *ab Hæreditate* ſeem to be imply'd. To conclude this matter: 'Tis plain by theſe Examples, and you know it would be eaſy to give a Thouſand more, that tho the Genius of our Language may oblige us ſometimes to render βαπτίζω, *to wet*, or *waſh*, or *dye*, *&c.* 'tis moſt abſurd to infer that it therefore ſignifies any thing elſe beſides or different from to *dip*: whereas it appears always to include *dip*, and means to *wet*, or *waſh*, or *dye*, *&c.* only by *dipping*.

If any Particulars I have inſiſted on above ſhou'd be thought too trifling to deſerve arguing about, I am however to be excus'd; for it muſt be conſider'd, that Mr. *Wall* and others, having urg'd 'em againſt us, it was neceſſary on that account to give 'em an Anſwer.

And, if what I have ſaid, ſhou'd not carry full Conviction to any, ſo as to finiſh this Part of the Controverſy, yet methinks 'tis the moſt reaſonable Thing in the World to allow, that tho the Word had been ever ſo ambiguous in it ſelf, and extenſive in its ſignification, yet as it relates to the Sacrament of Baptiſm, the Senſe is plainly enough determin'd in Scripture to be *to dip*, by ſeveral Circumſtances; and that the Doctrine and Practice of St. *John*, our SAVIOUR himſelf, and his Apoſtles, and the Primitive Church, are ſufficient to aſcertain how it muſt be underſtood and practis'd: therefore let us

hear

hear how the Scripture confirms this Particular in our behalf.

That St. *John* baptiz'd by dipping, is as plain as a thing can well be: and were it not for the daring Tempers of ſome Men, it wou'd be trifling, in ſuch an exceſs of Light, to attempt to prove it. But becauſe I ſhall be allow'd to ſay nothing, without a Demonſtration, I refer you to *John* iii. 23. which will remain unanſwerable, till ſome body, by a mighty Stretch, can find ſome other Turn than has been yet thought of, for the holy Penman's giving this as the reaſon of his baptizing in thoſe Parts, *Becauſe there was much Water.* *Dr.* Whitby, on the Place, ſays, *In which their whole Bodys might be dip'd:* and adds, *in this manner only* was their Baptiſm perform'd. If any other wetting wou'd have ſerv'd, this had been impertinent, and no Reaſon at all; for there's no habitable Part of the World, but wou'd have furniſh'd Water enough for that purpoſe.

Again, *Mark* i. 5. *And were all baptiz'd of him in the River Jordan, confeſſing their Sins.* Which, I pray you, is moſt natural to ſuppoſe, that the River was pour'd or ſprinkl'd on them, or they dip'd into the River? If it was not the firſt, it muſt be the laſt; for no body can bring himſelf to imagine, they were pour'd or ſprinkl'd on the River, or the River dip'd into them. And Mr. *Wall* himſelf owns St. *John* baptiz'd our LORD thus. And this ſhews what was his Method in baptizing. What now can have a greater face of Truth, than to think our BLESSED SAVIOUR, when he appointed this Ordinance of Baptiſm, meant the ſame thing exactly, and underſtood and intended the Word in the ſame Senſe that it was known generally and moſt properly to be us'd in, and which was fix'd to it by the publick

publick Practice of the Perſon from whom he continu'd the Ceremony?

When People had been us'd, for ſome time, to a religious Baptiſm, which was perform'd by dipping, they cou'd not poſſibly underſtand our LORD to mean any thing elſe: and if he had deſign'd a different manner from that of St. *John*, he wou'd doubtleſs, at leaſt, have avoided a Word which from St. *John*'s Example, if it were nothing elſe, was liable to be reſtrain'd to *dipping* only. But ſince He has us'd the ſame Word, which, beſides its natural Import, was limited to this Senſe by the Practice of St. *John*, in this very Ceremony, and has giv'n us no manner of Caution againſt reſtraining it to this Senſe; it follows, that we muſt in Juſtice allow this alone to be what our LORD intended by it: And accordingly, which carrys the thing much farther, the holy Apoſtles, and the firſt Chriſtians, 'tis plain, underſtood it ſo. Their Practice will, ſurely, be granted a very good Commentary on CHRIST's Inſtitution, and an unexceptionable Rule to guide us in ſetting this matter in its true Light.

Hardly any Man of Learning will deny the Chriſtians of the firſt Times us'd dipping, and that in obedience to our SAVIOUR's Commiſſion. Thus, when *Philip* baptiz'd the Eunuch, Great Treaſurer to *Candace* Queen of the *Ethiopians*, 'tis ſaid, *Acts* viii. 38. *And they went down both into the Water, both* Philip *and the Eunuch, and he baptiz'd him.* I take this to be a plain Caſe, notwithſtanding the little frivolous Cavils that have formerly been made againſt it; and the Propriety of the Words ſeparately in themſelves, and much more in this particular Conſtruction, neceſſitate us to underſtand 'em in the Senſe I maintain.

Beſides, there are likewiſe many Alluſions which the Apoſtles make, that can't poſſibly be underſtood

ſtood of any thing but dipping into the Water. *Grotius* noted this before; and undoubtedly the Inference is very juſt. You may read him on *Col.* ii. 12. where thoſe who had been baptiz'd, are ſaid to be bury'd with Him (*viz.* our LORD) in Baptiſm, *&c.* Dr. *Hammond*, in his Paraphraſe of this Verſe, and of *Rom.* vi. 4. does expreſly fix the juſtneſs of the Alluſion in the Practice of immerſing and dipping Perſons into the Water, which, he allows without any difficulty, was the way at that time. And Dr. *Whitby* ſays, *'Tis expreſly declar'd here, that we are bury'd with CHRIST in Baptiſm, by being bury'd under Water*; or, as he words it in his Paraphraſe, *plunging us under the Water*; which, as he intimates, repreſented the putting CHRIST's *Body under the Earth.* And indeed, the Apoſtle's Words, *Rom.* vi. 3, 4. are ſo very clear to this purpoſe, that we need only open our Eyes, and read 'em, to be convinc'd: *Know ye not*, ſays he, *that ſo many of us as were baptiz'd into CHRIST, were baptiz'd into His Death? Therefore we are bury'd with Him by Baptiſm into Death; that like as CHRIST was rais'd up from the Dead by the Glory of the FATHER, even ſo we alſo ſhou'd walk in Newneſs of Life.*

The *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions* give the Senſe thus: * *Baptiſm is a Repreſentation of CHRIST's Death; the Water is that wherein we are bury'd.* And a little after: *The Immerſion is the dying with Him; and Emerſion, or coming up from under the Water, repreſents the Reſurrection.* And, therefore,

---

* Lib. 3. cap. 17. Τοίνυν τὸ ἅγιον Βάπτισμα, εἰς τὸν Θάνατον τοῦ ΙΗΣΟΥ δίδόμενον. τὸ μὲν ὕδωρ ἀντὶ Ταφῆς. & paulo poſt: ἡ μὲν κατάδυσις, τὸ συναποθανεῖν· ἡ δὲ Ἀνάδυσις τὸ συνεγείρεσθαι.

Tertullian

Tertullian likewiſe ſays, † *We die ſymbolically in Baptiſm:* upon which Words *Rigaltius* remarks; ‖ *We are immers'd as if we ſuffer'd Death, and riſe up out of the Water, as reviving again.*

And 'tis worth while to tranſcribe a Paſſage from St. *Chryſoſtom*, where he ſays, ** *To be dip'd and plung'd into the Water, and then to riſe out of it again, is a Symbol of our Deſcent into the Grave, and of our Aſcent out of it: And, therefore,* Paul *calls Baptiſm a Burial, when he ſays, we are therefore bury'd with him by Baptiſm into Death.*

I argue farther, that this continu'd to be the Practice of the Primitive Chriſtians, and of many Centurys together. St. *Barnabas* ſays in his Epiſtle, †† *We deſcend into the Water full of Sins and Defilement, and come up out of it,* &c. *Tertullian* almoſt conſtantly uſes *tinguere, mergitare,* &c. which ſignify to *dip,* and *immerſe,* as properly as he cou'd poſſibly expreſs it: And in his Treatiſe concerning Baptiſm he has theſe Words, which deſcribe, at the ſame time, the Cuſtom of that Age, and what they took to have been the Practice of St. *John,* &c. |||| *'Tis all one,*

---

† De Reſurrectione, pag. 354. Per ſimulacrum enim morimur in Baptiſmate, &c.

‖ Mergimur, quaſi mortem ſubeamus. Emergimus, ut reviviſcentes.

** Hom. 40. in 1 Cor. Tom. 3. pag. 514. Τὸ γὰρ βαπτίζεσθαι καὶ καταδύεσθαι, εἶτα ἀνανεύειν, τύπος ἐστὶ τοῦ εἰς ᾅδου καταβάσεως ἐστι Σύμβολον, καὶ τύπος ἐκεῖθεν ἀνόδου. διὸ καὶ Ταφὴν τὸ Βάπτισμα ὁ Παῦλος καλεῖ λέγων, Συνταφησόμεν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ Βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν Θάνατον.

†† Cap. 11. pag. 38. Ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἐν καταβαίνομεν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ γέμοντες Ἀμαρτιῶν καὶ Ῥύπου, καὶ ἀναβαίνομεν καρποφοροῦντες, &c.

|||| Cap. 4. Ideoq; nulla diſtinctio eſt, mari quis an ſtagno, flumine an fonte, lacu an alveo diluatur. Nec quicquam refert inter eos quos Joannes in Jordane, & quos Petrus in Tiberi tinxit.

ſays

says he, *whether we are wash'd in the Sea, or in a Pond; in a Fountain, or in a River; in a standing, or in a running Water: Nor is there any difference beween those that* John *baptiz'd in* Jordan, *and those that* Peter *baptiz'd in the* Tiber. In another Place he says, * *Our Hands are clean enough, which, together with our whole Body, we have once wash'd in Christ.* And *Gregorius Thaumaturgus*, † speaking of the Baptism of CHRIST, uses καλάδυσον, *to plunge or dip*, as a synonymous Word for βάπτισον, *dip, plunge me into the River* Jordan.

Nay, so far were they from contenting themselves with any thing less than dipping, that 'tis notorious, they very strenuously pleaded for, and insisted on a trine Immersion. Thus Dr. *Beveridge*, late Bishop of St. *Asaph*, explains the 42*d* of those Canons that are ascrib'd to the Apostles; which rigidly enjoyns, ‖ *If any Bishop or Presbyter shall administer Baptism only by one Immersion into the Death of* CHRIST, *and not by three Immersions, let him be degraded.* And *Tertullian* most expressly says, which evidently demonstrates what was the Custom in his time, ** *We are immers'd not once, but thrice,* viz. *into each* PERSON *as he is nam'd:* Or, as the Rubrick of the present *Greek* Church expresses it, *At each Compellation putting him* (*viz.* the bap-

* De Orat. pag. 133. Ceterum satis mundæ sunt manus, quas cum toto corpore in CHRISTO semel lavimus.

† In Theophan. pag. 35. Καλάδυσόν με τῆς Ἰορδάνε Ῥεέθρεις.

‖ Εἴτις Ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ Πρεσβύτερος, μὴ τρία Βαπτίσματα μιᾶς Μυήσεως ὁλοτελέσῃ, ἀλλὰ ἓν Βάπτισμα τὸ εἰς τὸν Θάνατον τοῦ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ διδόμενον, καθαιρείσθω.

** Adversus Praxeam cap. 26. pag. 516. Nam nec semel, sed ter, ad singula Nomina in PERSONAS singulas tinguimur.

tiz'd

tiz'd Perſon) *down into the Water, and raiſing him up again.* St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* ſays very emphatically, †*plunge 'em down,* καταδύσατε, *thrice into the Water, and raiſe 'em up again.* *Monnulus*, Biſhop of *Girba*, in his Suffrage, which is the 10th in St. *Cyprian*'s Account of the Council of *Carthage*, calls it *Baptiſmatis Trinitate*, ſays the Learned Biſhop of *Oxford*, *becauſe it was celebrated by a trine Immerſion.*

Inſtead of more Citations from the Fathers, give me leave to mention ſome of our Learned Moderns, who, upon very nice Examination, confirm this to have been the Practice of the earlieſt Times. And this I chuſe rather to do, becauſe at the ſame time it ſhews, not only that I am right in my Aſſertion, but alſo that the moſt Learned and Judicious Criticks acknowledg and confirm the Truth of it; which is a double Advantage.

Dr. *Beveridge*, whom I nam'd but now, at the beginning of his Annotations on the 50th Canon, and in his Vindication of the Canons againſt *Daillé*, largely aſſerts the trine Immerſion. So does the Learned *Dionyſius Petavius*, in theſe Words: ‖ *Their wonted Manner of adminiſtring this Sacrament was to plunge the Perſons baptiz'd thrice into the Water*, &c. And the Celebrated *Johan. Gerard. Voſſius* ſpeaks to the ſame Effect in his *Etymologicon*, at the word *Baptiſmus*. *Caſaubon* on *Matt.* iii. 6. ſays, * *The Form of Baptizing*

---

† Catechet. Myſtagog. cap. 2. pag. 232. Καὶ καταδύσατε εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ πάλιν ἀνεδύσατε.

‖ De Pœnitentia, Lib. 2. cap. 1. §. 11. Ratio autem ſolita Adminiſtrandi hujus Sacramenti erat, ut ter in aquam immergerentur qui baptizabantur.

* Hic enim fuit baptizandi ritus, ut in aquam immergerentur, &c.

was by plunging into the Water, &c. The Passage is quoted above at large. *Episcopius*, in his Answer to *Quest.* 35. tells us, † *Those who were baptiz'd, by the Ceremony of plunging into the Water, and rising out of it again, declar'd themselves to be as it were dead*, &c. Monsr. *Jurieu* assures us, in his Pastoral Letters, that the Antients ‖ *us'd to plunge Persons into the Water, calling on the Adorable* TRINITY. And in another Place, * *Because Baptism was then administred by Immersion*, &c. And, a little after, †† *He that was baptiz'd, was plung'd into the Water.*

Monsr. *Le Clerc*, whom you so deservedly honour for his great Learning, says the same thing, on *Rom.* vi. 4. ‖‖ *The Manner of Baptizing at that time, by plunging into the Water those whom they baptiz'd, was an Image of the Burial of* JESUS CHRIST.

The Learned Antiquary, Mr. Archdeacon *Nicholson*, at present Bishop of *Carlisle*, in his Letter to Sir *William Dugdale*, concerning the Font at *Bridekirk* in *Cumberland*, as 'tis publish'd in the *Additions* to Mr. *Camden's Britannia*, ** takes notice, *There is fairly represented on the Font, a Person in a long Sacerdotal Habit* dipping *a Child into the Water.* And presently remarks on it thus: *Now, Sir, I need not acquaint you that the Sacrament of Baptism was antiently ad-*

† Pag. 34. Nam ii qui baptizabantur, ritu isto Immersionis & Emersionis testabantur se mortuorum instar esse, &c.

‖ Let. 5. An. 1686. pag. 36. On se contentoit de plonger les personnes dans l'Eau, avec l'Invocation de l'Adorable *TRINITE.*

* Let. 6. An. 1686. pag. 42. Parce qu' alors le Batême se faisoit par Immersion, &c.

†† Celui qui etoit bâtizé, etoit plongé dans l'Eau.

‖‖ La maniere que l'on avoit alors de baptizer, en plongeant dans l'Eau ceux que l'on baptizoit, etoit comme une image de la sepulture de JESUS CHRIST.

** Pag. 841.

miniſtred by plunging into the Water, in the Weſtern as well as the Eaſtern Part of the Church; and that the Gothic *word* . . . . . (Mark i. 8. *and* Luke iii. 7, 12.) *the* German *word* **tauffen**; *the* Daniſh *word* **Dobe**, *and the* Belgic **doopen**, *do as clearly make out that Practice, as the* Greek *word* βαπτίζω.

I'll give you but one Citation more, which is too remarkable to be omitted. 'Tis Dr. *Whitby*'s Annotation on *Rom.* vi. 4. *It being ſo expreſly declar'd here, and* Coloſſ. ii. 12. that we are bury'd with CHRIST in Baptiſm, *by being bury'd under Water: And the Argument to oblige us to a Conformity to his Death, by dying to Sin, being taken thence; and this* Immerſion *being religiouſly obſerv'd by* ALL CHRISTIANS FOR XIII CENTURYS, AND APPROV'D BY OUR CHURCH, AND THE CHANGE OF IT INTO SPRINKLING EVEN WITHOUT ANY ALLOWANCE FROM THE AUTHOR OF ITS INSTITUTION, OR ANY LICENCE FROM ANY COUNCIL OF THE CHURCH, *being that which the* Romaniſt *ſtill urgeth to juſtify his refuſal of the Cup to the Laity; it were to be wiſh'd that this Cuſtom might be again of general Uſe.* What follows concerning Aſperſion being not to the purpoſe, I omit it.

If you pleaſe you may ſee more Inſtances of this nature in Mr. *Stennet*'s Anſwer to *Ruſſen*, and particularly thoſe taken out of Sir *John Floyer*; but theſe, I think, are enough to put it paſt doubt, that the Apoſtles and primitive Chriſtians did baptize only by Immerſion; and that this Rite continu'd in the Church for many Centurys.

To evade the Force of this, Mr. *Wall* is willing to compound the Matter with us, and allows, they did generally baptize by Immerſion: but then in ſome Caſes, as in danger of Death, *&c.* he pretends they thought Affuſion or Sprink-

Sprinkling sufficient; and that in such Cases it was actually permitted. In answer to this, I say:

1. Supposing these Exceptions to be well grounded, and that Aspersion was suffer'd in Cases of Necessity; yet even then, it must follow, that according to the Sentiments of the Antients, 'twas utterly unlawful to use Aspersion in any common Cases, or at all, but in such Necessity: For they never thought themselves at liberty to administer this Sacrament in what manner they wou'd, as our Author pleads; and that to baptize, as he will have it, is to wash in any manner: and it is still plain, that a general, and much more then a total disuse of Immersion, is the greatest Affront to those pious Saints, and the whole primitive Virgin Church, that can be well offer'd; and it must be no small Presumption, to fancy CHRIST did not enjoin what they so strictly and universally practis'd.

'Tis not to be imagin'd, the pious primitive Fathers, and the whole Church of that Time, cou'd be guilty of the absurd Folly, of tying themselves up so unnecessarily, and even contrary to what, according to Mr. *Wall*, they knew to be the Sense of the Word, and the Design of CHRIST. This is not at all consistent with his pretended Veneration for the Fathers, nor his building his darling Pædobaptism so entirely on this Foundation. I can't think they wou'd commit such Innovations so early: But if CHRIST had intended, and the Word He express'd Himself by had imply'd, that Baptism might be regularly administer'd by one kind of Washing as well as another, they wou'd, doubtless, have *stood fast in that Liberty*, for some time, at least; whereas, even tho Mr. *Wall*'s Supposition be true, that in some Cases of *Necessity* they did dispense with Immersion, yet 'tis plain, they held Dipping the only

general regular way, which nothing but endangering a Man's Life cou'd make 'em ſuperſede. This appears from St. *Cyprian*, the earlieſt Advocate for Aſperſion; which nevertheleſs he pleads for only in extraordinary Caſes.

And it ſeems at firſt to have been admitted upon this Notion, that GOD *will have Mercy and not Sacrifice*; which they underſtood to mean, that all poſitive Inſtitutions muſt give way to the eternal Obligation of moral Dutys. So *David*, from the Neceſſity of preſerving his and his Followers Lives, made free with the Shew-Bread, in oppoſition to the poſitive Command; and our SAVIOUR Himſelf vindicates his Diſciples from the ſame Principles, and from this Example of *David*, *Matth.* xii.

This Foundation is certainly very good; and they might from hence juſtify their forbearing to adminiſter this Sacrament at all, in ſuch Caſes, where 'tis apparent it cou'd not be adminiſter'd without violating ſome unchangeable moral Duty. But the Antients who introduc'd Sprinkling or Affuſion, ſeem'd unwilling to carry the Matter ſo far. In preſent danger of Death, they thought it neceſſary that all ſhou'd be made Partakers of the Salutary Illumination, without which, they imagin'd, it wou'd be impoſſible to obtain Salvation; and yet they fear'd, leſt baptizing 'em according to the Inſtitution, might, conſidering their Weakneſs, occaſion their Death, and ſo they ſhou'd become guilty of Murder. To avoid both Inconveniences, they thought it beſt to divide the Difficulty; and rather than diſpenſe with the whole Sacrament, to make this Alteration in the Manner of its Adminiſtration only; which, after all, was in reality no better than nullifying the whole: For if CHRIST commanded only to *dip*, as themſelves vehemently urge,

in

in all Cases where it can be safely comply'd with, then nothing but dipping is obeying the Institution. But they thought 'twas better to retain some, tho but a distant Shadow, than to part with the whole Ceremony; in hopes GOD wou'd indulge 'em in this Change, which they were driv'n to by Necessity, as they thought; and that He wou'd annex all those spiritual Advantages to it, which shou'd have attended a more regular Administration. At most, they only pretended Affusion might serve where Immersion cou'd not, as they imagin'd, take place so well. And this is formally to acknowledg, that, strictly, the Institution requir'd Immersion only; as most naturally follows from their rigorous insisting on it in all ordinary Cases, and allowing Affusion as an Exception to the Rule upon some Emergence, where the Rule cou'd not be so conveniently obey'd.

Now, no serious reasonable Man can be so much overseen, as to think it just to interpret a Law by the Exceptions that are made to it, any farther than to infer the Exceptions are different from the Law, and opposite to it, the true Sense of which shou'd be determin'd by the ordinary Cases 'tis suppos'd only to respect.

Tho the thing is plain enough in it self, yet having found by Experience, how unreasonably some Men can cavil as to this Point in particular, I thought there was need enough to dwell so long upon it, and make such frequent Repetitions. On the same account, I must take the liberty to illustrate what I said in the last Words, by an Example, which, if possible, may yet make it more plain what 'tis I mean. Your good Sense and Candor, Sir, I am sensible wou'd save me the trouble; but you tell me my Letters shall be shewn, and I don't know who may be my Rea-

ders: Out of Precaution therefore, if any of 'em ſhou'd think the matter not ſufficiently clear, I deſire they wou'd conſider, Whether becauſe the Quakers by a Clauſe in ſome Acts, are excus'd from Swearing, they can think the Deſign of the Law was to make it indifferent in all Caſes, whether any Man in general took an Oath, or only made the Affirmation; and that it ſhou'd be at the liberty of every one to chooſe? The Toleration-Act binds all Perſons whatever, not to moleſt the Proteſtant Diſſenters in the free Exerciſe of religious Worſhip according to the Dictates of their Conſciences: but at the ſame time, by a Clauſe purpoſely inſerted, it provides, that no *Papiſt or Popiſh Recuſant whatſoever, or any Perſon that ſhall deny, in his Preaching or Writing, the Doctrine of the* BLESSED TRINITY, ſhall have *any Eaſe, Benefit, or Advantage* thereby. Now, can it be imagin'd from hence, that the full Senſe and Tenor of this Act is, that thoſe who are in Power, have liberty hereby giv'n 'em, either to tolerate or diſturb, as they pleaſe, Perſons diſſenting from the Eſtabliſh'd Church?

I will compare theſe Inſtances, to ſhew they are exactly parallel.

1. The Fathers (on whoſe Practice we are now chiefly arguing) for ſome Centurys, made Immerſion neceſſary and indiſpenſible in all ordinary Caſes. This is ſo undeniable, that our Adverſarys allow it; and that ſo far as the Practice of the primitive Church is our Rule, we are oblig'd, in all ordinary Caſes, to baptize by Immerſion. To this, in the Inſtance giv'n, anſwers the general Tenour of the Act, *viz.* That Proteſtant Diſſenters ſhall be tolerated in the free Exerciſe of religious Worſhip according to their own way.

2. The

2. The primitive Church, as 'tis suppos'd, has made an Exception to this her general Practice, and allows of Affusion, to those who are in present danger of Death, instead of Immersion. So the Act excepts, together with *Papists and Popish Recusants*, all such as *shall deny, in Preaching or Writing, the Doctrine of the* BLESSED TRINITY; to whom it means no Protection.

Since the Cases then are so far parallel, I might conclude, 'tis as unreasonable to argue from the Exception the antient Church is suppos'd to have made in some Cases of Necessity, that they therefore thought themselves at full liberty always to administer this Ordinance by any kind of washing, (which is Mr. *Wall*'s Argument) as all the World knows, it wou'd be, because of that Exception made in the Act, to infer, that the Design and true Meaning of it is to oblige all Persons to tolerate the Dissenters, or disturb 'em, as they please.

At the same rate it will argue farther too, that if those who deny the TRINITY, in whatever Communion, are not to be tolerated, therefore none is under any Obligation to tolerate any of that Communion; then the Church of *England* her self can't so much as make any Pretence to Toleration neither; for there are some of the rankest Socinians in her Bosom, that ever appear'd. See what strange Work Mr. *Wall*'s Art of Reasoning wou'd make: but I will leave it to be study'd and practis'd by himself only. As it wou'd be nothing but bantring the Act, and the Royal Authority which gave it Sanction, to argue upon it at this rate; so it must needs make that Man appear very ridiculous, who can seriously pretend to argue, that because the antient Church thought Baptism might be administer'd by Affusion in some Cases, therefore they thought it might as well be administer'd so in all.

The antient Church ſufficiently intimates, the Strictneſs of the Law requir'd Immerſion, and that ſhe underſtood this to be the Senſe of CHRIST in this Commiſſion He gave to His Apoſtles; ſince they had no other Authority to urge for making Immerſion ſo indiſpenſible in ordinary Caſes. And as to that Exception, 'tis beyond all Controverſy, they doubted the Validity of it themſelves; and 'tis certain, there is no room for it in the Commiſſion, if the Command to baptize can't be obey'd without Immerſion, as they declare it can't in ordinary Caſes. Nor does this ſame Command allow Aſperſion, or direct to it: and we know of no Exception made in the Text, nor of any Command beſides this general one.

The Church of *England*, and, if our Author be right, which I muſt examine hereafter, the Apoſtles, and primitive Chriſtians too, always admitted Infants to Baptiſm, without requiring of 'em a perſonal Profeſſion of Faith, ſuppoſing them to be excepted when CHRIST commanded to baptize thoſe that believe. Now, if this ſhou'd be granted to be true, wou'd any Man be ſo wild as to infer, that therefore it is indifferent, whether *Any* believe and make a Profeſſion of their Faith before they are baptiz'd; and that CHRIST has left it entirely to the Diſcretion of every one, whether he will require a publick Profeſſion of Faith from *all* he baptizes, or from *none*, or from *ſome* only? This is moſt exactly Mr. *Wall*'s way of arguing.

But thus far I have gone upon the Suppoſition that the Apoſtles and primitive Church did uſe Aſperſion: In the next place, I ſay,

2. This Suppoſition is utterly falſe and groundleſs; on which account, there is ſtill much leſs, or rather no force at all in the Objection. No Man living, I am ſure, can ſhew me any Foundation

tion for it in Scripture: Mr. *Wall* does not attempt it; but only inſinuates in general, that notwithſtanding 'tis plain from the Example of St. *John*'s baptizing CHRIST, *&c.* that * *they did in thoſe hot Countrys baptize* ordinarily *by Immerſion*; it does not follow, *that in Caſes of Sickneſs, or other ſuch* extraordinary *Occaſions, they never baptiz'd otherwiſe.* So reſolv'd he is to hold his Opinion, that he dares make even the Silence of Scripture an Argument for him. He forgot, 'tis likely, his own Rule to judg of the Senſe of a Scripture-Word, by its uſe in Scripture; for by the ſame Reaſon that the Scripture is thought to be of ſufficient Authority to determine the Senſe of a Word, 'tis much more of Authority to determine what was the Practice in relation to an Ordinance of CHRIST; and we ought to acquieſce in the account it gives, and not raſhly ſuppoſe what is not ſo much as in the leaſt hinted at.

To the Words above-cited, our Author immediately adds, *Of this I ſhall ſpeak in the next Chapter.* This fill'd me with Expectation of ſomething which might have an appearance of Probability at leaſt: but when I came to the place, no body was ever diſappointed more; for I met with little elſe but Inſtances from the later Centurys: Mr. *Wall* ſeems to have forgot his Promiſe, and never goes about to prove that any were baptiz'd in the Apoſtolical Times, otherwiſe than by plunging. St. *Cyprian*, indeed, in his Letter to *Magnus*, endeavours to juſtify Aſperſion by ſeveral Paſſages in the Old Teſtament, after a very frivolous manner; and what but tenaciouſneſs of an Opinion cou'd put any one on the extravagant Method of determining

* Part II. p. 219.

the

the manner of adminiſtring a Chriſtian Sacrament by obſcure Paſſages in the Prophets, and by Words in the Law, which manifeſtly relate nothing at all to the matter? Nay, which makes the thing ſtill worſe, from theſe Paſſages alone, he determines the matter not only without, but directly contrary to the whole tenour of the New Teſtament.

Obſerve here, that this Conduct of St. *Cyprian* is a very plain confeſſion, that there is nothing to favour his Notion in the New Teſtament; and that the Senſe of the Word in our LORD's Commiſſion, and other places, is limited ſo as not to admit of *pour* or *ſprinkle:* for otherwiſe *Magnus* cou'd not have made a Queſtion concerning the Validity of Aſperſion; or if he had, the Anſwer had been very ready and natural, without recourſe to the myſterious Types and Alluſions of the Law and the Prophets, *viz.* to have ſaid, That the common Practice of the Apoſtles, *&c.* ſufficiently juſtify'd that manner of Adminiſtration, and more eſpecially, that the general Signification of the Word us'd in the Commiſſion, comprehended that manner as well as any other.

'Tis matter of Wonder to me, that St. *Cyprian* ſhou'd ſo miſapply thoſe Texts, and that the learned Dr. *Beveridge* ſhou'd ſo eaſily give into the Error, and venture to ſay, that † St. *Cyprian had largely prov'd, and that from the Scriptures themſelves too, that Baptiſm might be rightly adminiſter'd by Aſperſion.* I will lay one of that Father's Proofs before you, Sir, that you may judg of the force of his reaſonings.

He quotes *Numb.* xix. 13. *Whoſoever touches the dead Body of any Man that is dead, and purifys not himſelf, defiles the Tabernacle of the* LORD; *and*

† In Canon. Apoſtol. 50. *p.* 468. *b. med.*

that

that Soul ſhall be cut off from Iſrael, *becauſe the Water of Separation was not ſprinkled upon him.* What Man that ever liv'd, of a common Imagination, nay or of the moſt luxuriant Fancy, cou'd have ſuppos'd that theſe Words have any reſpect to a Chriſtian Sacrament, or infer from 'em that it ſhou'd be adminiſter'd by ſprinkling? But I conſider, warm zealous Men often ſee with Eyes very different from what other Men ſee with, eſpecially ſuch as are myſtically given; for they make Myſterys of every thing, and ſee every thing in their Myſterys. So ſome great Head-pieces, of a moſt profound Invention to be ſure, have diſcover'd both Sacraments in the Words of the Spouſe, *Canticles* vii. 2. *Thy Navel is like a round Goblet, which wanteth not Liquor; thy Belly is like a heap of Wheat ſet about with Lillys.*

A Gentleman who is one of the zealous Writers of our Time, has improv'd this in a very ſurprizing manner; and ſince he has ventur'd to publiſh it to the World himſelf, it can be no Crime in me to tranſcribe the Paſſage in a private Letter to a Friend: || *And by the by,* ſays he, *here is a great Controverſy ſolv'd, namely, between us and the Anabaptiſts, who are againſt the baptizing of Children, becauſe they are not come to Years of Underſtanding. Let it be remember'd, from what is ſuggeſted to us here, that Infants (according to the Notion which prevail'd in thoſe Days) receive Nouriſhment by the Navel, tho they take not in any Food by the Mouth; yea, tho (according to the opinion of thoſe Times) they did not ſo much as uſe their Mouths. So it is no good Objection againſt baptizing Infants, that they are ignorant, and underſtand not what they do; and that they are not able to take in the ſpiritual Nou-*

|| Dr. *Edwards*'s Exercitat. on *Canticles* vii. 2. *p.* 136, 137.

riſhment

riſhment after the ordinary way; if it may be done (as 'tis ſaid here) by the Navel, by that federal Knot or Link which ties 'em faſt to their Chriſtian and believing Parents; which, according to the beſt Divines, is an unanſwerable Argument to prove the Validity of Infant-Baptiſm: for they belong to the Covenant as they are the Offspring of the Faithful; and thence are pronounc'd Holy by the Apoſtle, 1 Cor. vii. 14. *And here alſo we ſee farther the Congruity of the Expreſſion here us'd by the wiſe Man; for the uſe of the* Navel *is not only to convey Nutriment to the* Fœtus, *but to faſten the* Fœtus *to the Mother: which denotes that intimate union and conjunction with the Church of* CHRIST, *our common Mother, that is made by the baptiſmal Performance.*

Whatever the Doctor may think of this fine Invention, barely to repeat ſuch Chimeras is to confute 'em; and I believe we ſhall none of us think it worth while to take any farther notice of this mighty *Solution of the Controverſy.*

Tho I have a great Reſpect for the primitive Fathers, and all learned Men; yet their looſe Expoſitions and Miſapplications of Scripture are not to be endur'd. The Citations in St. *Cyprian*, beſide the unfairneſs of 'em, run counter to the Hiſtory of the New Teſtament, and the primitive Church; for as to the Apoſtles themſelves, they declare, that all who were baptiz'd in their time, were baptiz'd by Immerſion. Nothing can be more expreſs to this purpoſe than *Rom.* vi. 3. *As many as were baptiz'd*, i. e. all, without Exception, who were baptiz'd *into* JESUS CHRIST, *were baptiz'd into His Death*; and this he calls, *Verſe* 4. being *bury'd with Him by Baptiſm.* So that 'tis as plain as Words can make it, that ſo many as were baptiz'd into CHRIST, were bury'd with him by Baptiſm; and none, I believe, are hardy enough to deny that this means, they were plung'd into

into the Water in their Baptiſm. Dr. *Whitby*, in his Annotations, judiciouſly obſerves on the Place, that, *the Argument to oblige us to a Conformity to His* (CHRIST's) *Death, by dying to Sin, is taken from hence*, that *we were bury'd with him in Baptiſm, by being bury'd under Water.* Now as he, from this and other Reaſons, adviſes to reſtore the Antient Manner of adminiſtring the Sacrament among us, I infer from it alſo, that as the Duty of conforming to CHRIST's Death, by a death to Sin, obliges all in general; ſo the Argument to enforce it, and perſuade to it, ſhou'd extend to all in common: and the holy Apoſtles, undoubtedly, accommodated their Reaſonings ſo as to be concluſive to all. And ſince the whole Streſs of St. *Paul*'s Argument lies in the Propriety of the Repreſentation of CHRIST's Death and Burial, made in Baptiſm, his Logick wou'd not have reach'd to any who had been baptiz'd by Affuſion, and the like. But as he ſeems plainly to deſign, from the Conſideration of their being bury'd with CHRIST by Baptiſm, to perſuade all in general to conform themſelves to his Death; ſo it ſeems neceſſary to ſuppoſe from hence, that all were then, and, that the Argument may not be render'd uſeleſs, ſhou'd be now, *bury'd with HIM by Baptiſm*, by being plung'd into the Water: for on no other Suppoſition can the Apoſtle's Words be conſiſtent with good Senſe, or of any force to us now.

It may be ſaid, tho the Apoſtles, and Chriſtians of their Time, did not baptize except by Immerſion, yet their immediate Succeſſors in the whole Church did, and allow'd of Affuſion, at leaſt in ſome Caſes. To this I anſwer:

1. That tho it were true, as 'tis far from being ſo, yet having gain'd this Point, that the Apoſtles themſelves, who were the Maſter-Builders of the true

true Church under CHRIST, never authoriz'd it, we are ſafe enough in reſolving not to vary from their unexceptionable Practice. We deſire to be Followers of them, even as they were Followers of CHRIST; and we prefer their Authority to all their Succeſſors, in oppoſition to 'em: and therefore if Mr. *Wall* ſhou'd be able to make out his Aſſertion, that the whole Church, after the Apoſtles Time, did allow of Affuſion, we may nevertheleſs think our ſelves oblig'd to withſtand it as an antient Corruption; for Error ſhou'd not be privileg'd by Age. But,

2. The Aſſertion is not true; and Mr. *Wall*'s way of proving it wou'd make one think he knew it was not: for he never attempts to cite any Inſtances till about 250 Years after CHRIST, which is 150 after the Apoſtles, according to his own Computation; that is, from the Death of St. *John*, who liv'd till more than a hundred Years after the Birth of CHRIST. So that in all this Space of Time, he points us to nothing, from which it can be ſo much as ſuſpected that Baptiſm was adminiſter'd by any other way than Immerſion. * Dr. *Beveridge*, I know, quotes *Tertullian*, who dy'd about *Anno Dom.* 220. but this is not early enough neither; and beſides, 'tis very plain to any one that reads the Paſſage, that it does not ſpeak of Baptiſm: *Cujuſlibet Aquæ*, is an invincible Bar againſt that Senſe; which ſignifys any ſort of Water, in oppoſition to that of Baptiſm, and not the Water of Baptiſm it ſelf; for the Senſe lies manifeſtly thus: *You are ſo far*, ſays the Father, *from being fit to be admitted to Baptiſm, that no body wou'd give even a Sprinkling of common Water to a Man of ſuch fallacious and uncertain Pe-*

* In Apoſtol. Can. 50.

nance.

nance. I find *Rigaltius* takes it much to this purpoſe too, and adds, that * *'Tis apparent trifling to underſtand theſe Words of Aſperſion in Baptiſm: For wherever he ſpeaks of Baptiſm, he uſes the Words,* Lavacrum, Tingere, Intingere, Ablui, Mergitari, *and* Immerſio, *which don't at all ſignify Aſperſion.* This, if it be conſider'd, is an Argument that *Tertullian* knew of no Cuſtom in his Time, of baptizing by Aſperſion, or any thing elſe but Dipping. And the other Fathers deliver in as full Evidence on our ſide.

Afterwards, indeed, about the middle of the third Century, I own there is mention made of this manner of adminiſtring, or, to ſpeak more properly, of eluding the Sacrament. Mr. *Wall* † inſtances in the Caſe of *Novatian*, near 250 Years after CHRIST; and confeſſes this is ‖ *the moſt antient Inſtance of that ſort of Baptiſm, that is now extant in Records.* This Acknowledgment is pretty fair, and in effect to own, he has no reaſon to ſay this Sacrament was adminiſter'd by Perfuſion, *&c.* till about 250 Years after our SAVIOUR. But to have been truly impartial, he ſhou'd have given notice, that even at that Time, they much doubted of the Validity of this Mode, as evidently appears by the very Paſſage Mr. *Wall* cites; which ſhews the Judgment of that Time was, that one who had been baptiz'd by Affuſion in Sickneſs on his Bed, cou'd not be lawfully admitted to any Office in the Church: which is the ſame thing as to ſay, he was not on a level with others who were baptiz'd more regularly.

---

* Splendide nugantur qui hæc Verba de Baptiſmo per Aſperſionem accipiunt. Nam ubicunque de Baptiſmo ſermonem facit, Lavacrum dicit, & Tingere, & Intingere, & Ablui, & Mergitari, & Immerſionem, quæ ſane Adſperſionem minime ſignificant.

† Part II. *p.* 292. ‖ Ib. *p.* 295.

Our

Our Author fetches the reaſon of this from a Canon of the Council of *Neocæſaria*, which however was not made till 80 Years after, and therefore can't be juſtly brought as any, much leſs the only reaſon of an Opinion that prevail'd ſo long before. On the contrary, 'tis clear, as *Valeſius* notes, that *this Baptiſm was thought imperfect for ſeveral Reaſons.* Petavius ſays, * *Such were thought irregularly baptiz'd, and were never admitted into holy Orders*; attributing it to their Perfuſion.

There is a remarkable Paſſage relating to this matter, which an unbyaſs'd Writer ought not to have omitted; but it ſhews the Judgment of that Time was not very agreeable to our Author's Hypotheſis. *Cornelius*, the ſitting Biſhop of *Rome*, after mentioning *Novatian*'s Caſe, who had been baptiz'd in his Bed by Perfuſion, (*for they fear'd he wou'd inſtantly die*, ſays the Letter) very frankly adds, by way of Caution and Diſtruſt, † *If ſuch a one may be ſaid to be baptiz'd*; which intimates he made a queſtion of it, and that he had no good opinion of that manner of adminiſtring the Ordinance. And any one wou'd think, this was the reaſon why he afterwards ſays, ‖ *it was not thought lawful for any who was baptiz'd in his Bed, becauſe of Sickneſs, by Perfuſion, to be admitted to any Charge in the Church.* And this is confirm'd by the learned Biſhop of *Oxford*, when he ſays, †† *Novatian was obnoxious on two accounts: Firſt, becauſe he had*

* *De Pœnitent. lib.* 2. *cap.* 1. §. 11. Ea Lege ut qui ſic baptizati fuerant irregulares haberentur, nec unquam in Sacros Eccleſiæ Ordines admitterentur.

† Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. *lib.* 6. *cap.* 43. Εἰ γε χρὴ λέγειν τὸ τυχόν τοῦτον εἰληφέναι.

‖ Ἐπεὶ μὴ ἔξὸν ἦν τῷ ἐν κλίνῃ διὰ Νόσον φωτισθέντα, εἰς κλῆρόν τινα ἥκειν, &c.

†† *In Cyprian. Epiſt.* 69. *p.* 297. Duplici nomine obnoxius videbatur Novatianus; primo, quod in cauſa Lapſorum Schiſma fecerit: ſecundo, quod in Lecto perfuſus non autem baptizatus fuerit.

made

made a Schism on account of the Lapsi; *and secondly, because tho he had Water pour'd on him in Bed, yet he was not baptiz'd.*

Constantine the Emperor seems to have been unwilling to trust to the Validity of these *Clinical Perfusions*, as we may gather from *Eusebius*'s Account of his Baptism. And the pious Prince himself, in his Speech to the Bishops, wherein he desires 'em to baptize him, tells 'em, *he had hop'd to have been made Partaker of the Salutary Grace in the River Jordan*; but a violent Fit of Sickness, which he rightly apprehended wou'd conclude his Life, made him look for that Happiness now no longer. But notwithstanding the danger of the Distemper, which actually kill'd him in a few Days, the Historian assures us, * he was not baptiz'd in his Bed, but, as was usual, in the Church, call'd *Martyrium Christi*, in the ordinary way, by *Eusebius* Bishop of *Nicomedia*; and with great Tranquillity of Mind soon after expir'd. But can it be imagin'd, if Perfusion or Aspersion was at that time thought so well of, as it is now pretended, that in so dangerous a Case, that good Emperor, tho an old Man, shou'd, without any Care or Tenderness, be baptiz'd in that way they accounted the most inconvenient and unnecessary? No, doubtless, the great Respect the Bishops had for him, wou'd have enclin'd 'em to persuade him to receive Baptism in the safest way imaginable.

I observ'd, that *Cornelius*, in the above-mention'd Letter to the Bishop of *Antioch*, adds, as the sole reason of their taking the Liberty of baptizing by Perfusion, their Supposition that *Novatian* wou'd quickly die, and not a direct Permission in Scripture; which is the same Excuse St. *Cyprian* palliates this Practice with:

* Vit. Constant. *lib.* 4. *cap.* 62.

and tho he pleads ſo much for it, he only pretends it was to be allow'd of * *in caſe of urgent Neceſſity*; hoping to come off with this Fancy.

But this way of baptizing was even then ſo rare and uncommon, that *Magnus*, tho a † diligent Enquirer into religious Matters, was perfectly ignorant of its having ever been uſual or allow'd in the Church; and rather ſeems to take it for granted, that this Caſe had occur'd before: and therefore he only asks St. *Cyprian*'s Opinion about it, what he thought beſt to be done in it, ſince neither the Practice of the Church, nor the Scripture, afforded any Rule. Accordingly, St. *Cyprian* anſwers only as from his own private Opinion, which he ſeems to give as in a dubious Point, as appears from his Words, which Mr. *Wall* tranſlates thus: || *You enquire alſo, dear Son, what I think of ſuch as obtain the Grace in time of their Sickneſs and Infirmity, whether they are to be accounted lawful Chriſtians; becauſe they are not waſh'd all over with the Water of Salvation, but have only ſome of it pour'd on 'em. In which matter, I wou'd uſe ſo much Modeſty and Humility, as not to preſcribe ſo poſitively, but that every one ſhou'd have the freedom of his own Thought, and do as he thinks beſt: I do, according to the beſt of my mean Capacity, judg thus, &c.* This Anſwer, ſure, is far from determining

---

* Urgente Neceſſitate.

† Cyprian. Epiſt 69. initio.

|| *Cyprian. Epiſt.* 69. *p.* 297. Quæſiſti etiam, Fili Cariſſime, quod mihi de illis videatur qui in Infirmitate & Languore Gratiam DEI conſequuntur, an habendi ſint legitimi Chriſtiani, eo quod Aqua Salutari non loti ſint, ſed perfuſi. Qua in Parte Nemini Verecundia & Modeſtia noſtra præjudicat, quo minus unuſquiſque quod putat, ſentiat & quod ſenſerit faciat. Nos, quantum concipit Mediocritas noſtra, æſtimamus, *&c.*

as

as if the matter were notorious and certain: and the whole ſum of all he ſays to the purpoſe, is, that GOD may, in urgent Neceſſity, diſpenſe with the Strictneſs of the Law; for he adds, when, as it were, he draws up the Concluſion: † *In the Sacraments of Salvation, the ſhorteſt Methods of Performance, under a preſſing Neceſſity,* (not elſe, by the way) *do, by GOD's gracious Indulgence, confer the whole Benefit.*

I think 'tis conſiderable, and well worth our notice, that *Cornelius* and *Magnus* ſaw nothing in Scripture to abet this Practice, nor underſtood our LORD's Inſtitution, or any Words or Phraſes, to be of a Latitude to countenance it; nor that Clinical Affuſions were ever us'd or favour'd in the Hiſtory of the Apoſtles, or of their Succeſſors. If they had, they cou'd not have queſtion'd their Validity: and St. *Cyprian*, ſo willing as he is to have the thing admitted, does not argue from any of theſe Heads, which is particularly to be obſerv'd. For it's known he was a warm Man, and a great Friend of the Power of the Clergy; of a lively Genius: and therefore certainly wou'd never have neglected theſe mighty Arguments, which are ſo directly to the purpoſe; and have contented himſelf with only ſpeaking doubtfully of the matter, and citing a Text or two, to ſhew, that Aſperſions were in uſe under the Law: and then, after all, refer it to the Determination of every one, who, he ſays, might lawfully think and act in the Caſe as he ſhou'd judg fit; which is placing the whole Validity in the Biſhop's Determination. No, this is not like St. *Cyprian* at all; he, doubtleſs, wou'd have pleaded the Practice of the A-

† *Pag.* 298. In Sacramentis Salutaribus, Neceſſitate urgente, & DEO indulgentiam ſuam largiente, totum Credentibus conferunt Divina Compendia.

poſtles. With what a Grace and Energy might he have reply'd to *Magnus*, in the Words he uſes on another occaſion: † *If we look back to the Head and Origin of divine Tradition, the Errors which are of humane Original will ceaſe; and from thence, the Nature of the celeſtial Sacraments being well underſtood, whatever was obſcur'd with Miſts, and hid in Clouds of Darkneſs before, will then appear in its true Light.* And a little after: *Thus it becomes the Prieſts of GOD to do, who wou'd keep the divine Law. If the Truth at any time be ſhaken, or uncertain; let us look back to the Divine Evangelick Origin, and Apoſtolick Tradition*, &c. And farther, he wou'd not have fail'd briskly to urge our SAVIOUR's Meaning, and the large Senſe of the word βαπτίζω, had he found 'em to be on his ſide. This had been ſounding the matter to the bottom, and ſolving the thing at once, in the moſt direct way that cou'd be thought of, and beyond any poſſible Reply. But that he ſhou'd wholly neglect this, and reaſon only from the Sprinklings under the Law, hunting out far-fetch'd Inferences, doubtful Preſumptions, very little or nothing to the purpoſe, and then leave the Caſe ſo uncertain at laſt, is an Argument to me, that neither CHRIST, nor the Apoſtles, nor the Church, were believ'd, even in St. *Cyprian*'s time, to have known or permitted theſe *Clinical Affuſions*, &c. But I am the more confirm'd in my Inference, from this Conſi-

† *Epiſt.* 74. *pag.* 317, 318. Nam ſi ad Divinæ Traditionis Caput & Originem revertamur, ceſſat Error humanus; & Sacramentorum cœleſtium Ratione perſpectâ, quicquid ſub Caligine ac Nube Tenebrarum obſcurum latebat, in Lucem Veritatis aperitur. *Et paulo poſt:* Quod & nunc facere oportet DEI Sacerdotes Præcepta Divina ſervantes; ut ſi aliquo nutaverit aut vacillaverit Veritas, ad Originem Dominicam & Evangelicam, & Apoſtolicam Traditionem revertamur, *&c.*

deration,

deration, that the reſt of the Church, and all the Fathers that have liv'd in it, as well as St. *Cyprian*, till lately, have had the Ingenuity to wave thoſe other Topicks, and defend Affuſion, *&c.* alone by the hope of GOD's Indulgence toward 'em, in altering that Circumſtance only in a Caſe of Neceſſity; and never dar'd attempt to juſtify it from Scripture, or the Practice of CHRIST and his Apoſtles, as now for ſome time has been done. For Mr. *Wall* can't find an antient Writer who will pretend, with him, that Baptiſm may be adminiſter'd indifferently in any manner; much leſs any who argues from the Signification of the *Greek* Word, or any Paſſage in the Chriſtian Canon, that Affuſion, or the like, is good and regular Baptiſm: On the contrary, it appears, they always inſiſted much upon Immerſion; and in a very antient Council, held here in *England*, under *Kenwolfe* King of the *Mercians*, *Anno* 816. 'tis expreſly order'd, that Baptiſm ſhall not be adminiſter'd by Sprinkling, but by Dipping. But what need is there to urge this, ſince our Author allows that the Opinion of the Neceſſity of Immerſion, at leaſt in ordinary Caſes, continu'd in moſt Parts of the World, eſpecially in *England*, for a long time; and ſtill prevails in the *Greek* Church, and, as he obſerves, wherever the Pope has had no Power; ſeeming to attribute the Alteration to the Liberty which he took and taught?

By this, Sir, I wou'd ſatisfy you, that the Church, even when it had admitted Affuſion, which it did only in Neceſſity, never pretended, as Mr. *Wall* does, to ground it on the Words of CHRIST, or on Eccleſiaſtical Practice: and this implys, that they do in effect deny, againſt our Author, that it cou'd be defended from thence. So that we have the Reaſon of the Thing, and the

Teſtimony of all Antiquity, as † *Petavius* ſays, with the concurring Authority of the whole Church for many Ages, againſt our Author in this Point.

Thus I have made it plain, from the conſtant Uſe of the word βαπτίζω in the *Greek* Authors, the Seventy, and the New Teſtament, and from the Authority of the beſt Criticks and moſt learned Men, that it always ſignifys only *to dip or plunge*, &c. and likewiſe that St. *John*, our SAVIOUR, the Apoſtles, and the whole primitive Church, conſtantly taught and practis'd accordingly; and that afterwards, when the Church took the Liberty to admit Sprinkling or Affuſion, it was thought imperfect and irregular, and allow'd in Caſes of neceſſity only, on a bare Preſumption of GOD's Indulgence. To which I added, that the Church never went about, till lately, to juſtify Affuſion, *&c.* by the Doctrine, or by the Practice of CHRIST, the Apoſtles, and primitive Times. From all this therefore, it ſtrongly follows, that Baptiſm ought conſtantly to be adminiſter'd by Immerſion or Dipping only; and that Affuſion, Sprinkling, or the like, are groundleſs, unwarrantable, and very dangerous Corruptions: and that 'tis as good Senſe to ſay a Man is dip'd, when only a drop or two of Water falls on him; as to ſay he is baptiz'd, when he is only ſprinkled.

Suffer me to put the Queſtion here: Since the Clergy allow, in general, Dipping was the antient manner, univerſally practis'd by St. *John*, by CHRIST, his Apoſtles, and the whole Church, for a long time together, and inſiſted on as the lawful and regular way, neceſſary in all common Caſes at leaſt; and that the primary Senſe of the

† Loco ſupra laudato.

Greek

Greek Word is to *dip:* nay, since they have wish'd this Custom might be again restor'd among us here in *England*, as it continu'd till about Queen *Elizabeth*'s Time; Why, after all these Concessions, *&c.* do they pretend 'tis indifferent, and that Baptism may be rightly administer'd any way; presuming, with † *Casaubon, the Force and Energy of this Sacrament is not plac'd in the manner* of its Administration? and why do they continue in the constant Use and Practice of Aspersion, *&c.* and defend it, in opposition to Immersion?

Here I am necessitated humbly to take notice of the Excuse which the most judicious and learned Bishop of *Sarum* has thought fit to make, for changing the manner of baptizing by *Dipping* into that of *Sprinkling*. His Lordship is pleas'd to observe on the 27th Article, that the primitive way of administring Baptism, was to *lead 'em into the Water*, &c. *and first lay 'em down in the Water*, &c. *then they rais'd 'em up again*, &c. which is a most express Acknowledgment, that Immersion was the true primitive manner: but yet afterwards, on the 30th Article, *Pag.* 346. he says, *The Danger of* Dipping *in cold Climates, may be a very good Reason for changing the Form of Baptism to* Sprinkling. This Excuse is now become very common, and, however insufficient it may seem in it self, has gather'd considerable Force by being us'd by Men of his Lordship's good Sense and Learning. But however great and honourable the Patrons of a Mistake may be, they are but Men; and the Authority of CHRIST, and the Respect and Obedience we owe to His Commands, shou'd counter-ballance all other Considerations: And his Lordship's own Words, a little after, a-

† *In* Matth. iii. 6. Cum non in eo posita sit Mysterii hujus Vis & Ἐνέργεια.

gainſt communicating in one Kind only, had been much more ſutably apply'd to the Sacrament of Baptiſm, than thoſe above-cited, and are a full Anſwer to 'em. 'Tis with abundance of Pleaſure I learn from his Lordſhip, that * *an Inſtitution of* CHRIST's *muſt not be alter'd or violated, upon the account of an Inference that is drawn to conclude it needleſs. He who inſtituted it, knew beſt what was moſt fitting, and moſt reaſonable; and we muſt chooſe rather to acquieſce in His Commands, than in our own Reaſonings.* Thus does his Lordſhip admirably argue, with that Force and Solidity that eminently appears in all his Lordſhip's Writings.

'Tis pretended, the Clergy wou'd gladly revive the antient Practice, and deſire, according to the Direction of the Rubrick, to baptize by Dipping all that are willing to receive it in that manner, and able to bear it. But if this Pretence be real, why don't they take proper Methods (unleſs they think it a Trifle not worth their Care) to recover it, and put down Sprinkling; to reform an Error, which will but grow ſtronger, and increaſe by continuance? For when no other Argument can be found, Antiquity and Cuſtom will be pleaded. If the Clergy wou'd, according to their declar'd Judgment in the Caſe, heartily endeavour to recover the true primitive Practice, I am well aſſur'd they cou'd not poſſibly fail of Succeſs; for I know that many, and I believe the greateſt Part of the Church of *England*, take their Opinion of Aſperſion from the Authority and Practice of the Reverend Clergy; it being obſervable, this is the main Thing they urge in its Defence. So that notwithſtanding their Pretences, 'tis to be fear'd the Clergy are a great Cauſe of the Corruption, and its Continuance. And how they will ever be able

* Page 347.

to

to answer this to GOD or their own Consciences, I know not, but heartily wish they wou'd take it timely into Consideration.

I don't know, Sir, whether you will except against my taking the Words βάπτω and βαπτίζω for synonymous. Some have formerly made a wide difference between 'em, allowing the first indeed to signify what we contend for, but maintaining that βαπτίζω, being a Derivative with a Termination which they call a Diminutive, does not signify so much as βάπτω: But I think 'tis plain from the Instances already mention'd, that they are ἰσοδύναμαι, exactly the same as to their Signification; tho some (as *Tertullian* seems to have done when he render'd it by *Mergitare*, and *Vossius* and *Stephens*) take it for a Frequentative, which signifys more than the Derivative, and not less, as in *English*, *to dip over and over again*. Besides, Mr. *Wall* seems to allow 'em to be synonymous, because he argues promiscuously from both. But I need not enlarge upon this; for all who are any thing acquainted with the *Greek* Tongue, know the common Criticism to be nothing but a ridiculous Piece of Pedantry. I will however subjoin a few Instances in the * Margin, to shew, Derivatives in ζω signify the same as their Primitives; which you may examine at your Leisure. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

---

* Βλύω, βλύζω. Θύω, θυάζω. Βορβορόω, βορβορίζω. Ὀρχέω, ὀρχίζω. Ἀλέγω, ἀλεγίζω. Καναχέω, καναχίζω. Ἔθω, ἐθίζω. Ἤθω, ἠθίζω, & infinita alia.

LETTER VI.

The other chief Article in diſpute between the Baptiſts and their Adverſarys. They continually repeat the moſt trifling Objections, tho they have been fairly anſwer'd over and over: Which has made it neceſſary to ſay a great deal to what has been well enough anſwer'd already, and concerning things which are very plain of themſelves. The late handling of this Controverſy has convinc'd the World, the Baptiſts are not that unreaſonable Sect they were repreſented to be: And 'tis not to be doubted but the reviving the Diſpute at preſent may go far to open People's Eyes yet much more in their Favour. 'Tis pity ſome friendly Meaſures are not taken to compoſe the Difference, which is not ſo impracticable as ſome fanſy. Mr. Wall's *Attempt, tho the beſt in its kind, falls very ſhort of anſwering the Deſign of it. His Scheme. He firſt allows it cannot be made appear from Scripture that Infants are to be baptiz'd: And therefore recurs to theſe as the only Expedients.* 1. *To the Practice of the* Jewiſh *Church.* 2. *To the Practice of the antient Chriſtians. Some Reflections which overturn all he ſays as to his main Concluſion, tho he ſhou'd prove theſe two Points ever ſo ſolidly. From his Conceſſion, that it cannot be prov'd from Scripture, it unavoidably follows, that 'tis no Inſtitution of* CHRIST. *And to ſuppoſe it may be included in ſome of the more general Expreſſions, is only to beg the thing in diſpute. Unleſs he can ſhew us Infant Baptiſm is ſo much as mention'd in Scripture, we ſhan't believe it's inſtituted there.*

there. Our Author makes the Scriptures the Rule of Language; which he therefore ought with much more reason to make the only Rule of his Faith and Practice. The Baptism of Infants is unlawful, if CHRIST *has not instituted it. True Protestants shou'd adhere to the Scripture, as the only infallible Guide in all religious Controversys. They who do otherwise seem to be too near the Church of* Rome, *as to the Article of Tradition at least; which is an Inlet to all the rest. Our Adversarys act very inconsistently in rejecting Tradition, in their Disputes with the* Romanists, *while they recur to it as their main Refuge in the present Dispute with us. That Infant Baptism ought not to be practis'd, is prov'd from our Author's Principles, compar'd with the Articles of the Church. It gives the* Romanists *a handle to weaken the Reformation with too much Advantage. The Articles of the Church directly against Traditions. The Scriptures silence as good an Argument against Pædo-baptism, as can be desir'd. We find a strong tendency in our Minds to depend upon the Scriptures only. We are oblig'd by any sort of Law, &c. only to the Particulars the said Law expresses. This illustrated by Instances, and by an undoubted Maxim from* Tertullian. *Apply'd also to the present Dispute, and illustrated by more Instances. Some build the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy mainly on that very Foundation on which the Baptizing of Infants is oppos'd. Mr.* Wall *sometimes argues in the same manner as the Baptists do against Pædo-baptism. The Objection, that* CHRIST *no where forbids us to baptize Infants, answer'd. We are forbid to teach the Traditions of Men for Commandments of* GOD. *The Pædo-baptist's Argument enervated by* Tertullian. *Tho the Scripture's silence may sometimes, it does not always leave it so much as Lawful to do what it does not mention.*

SIR,

NOW we have taken breath a little; if you pleaſe, Sir, we'll enter upon the other chief Article in diſpute between us and our Adverſarys.

If Mr. *Wall*, like ſome others, had argu'd with a great deal of concern, that 'tis unlawful to dip thoſe who are baptiz'd, becauſe it is a Breach of the Sixth Commandment, and virtually to Murder; undoubtedly you wou'd ſay this cou'd not have deſerv'd an Anſwer, and yet it cou'd not fairly have been paſs'd by neither.

Of the ſame kind exactly, or it may be more trifling, are the two main Foundations of Infant Baptiſm, I mean the celebrated Arguments from Original Sin, and from Circumciſion, which have been ſo often and fairly baffled, and yet are continually return'd upon us as gravely, as if nothing had ever been ſaid to 'em.

And if I ſhou'd be neceſſitated to make a formal Anſwer to theſe and ſome other ſuch Pretences, you know where to lay the fault, tho I deſign to avoid it all I can.

We were once taken for a very ſtrange ſort of People, and accordingly were furiouſly attack'd without any moderation; but our Adverſaries at length thought fit to let the Controverſy drop, the Effect of which has been only to perſwade the World we are not that unreaſonable miſchievous Sect we were repreſented to be. And it has been made appear, that we have abundantly more to ſay for our ſelves than was believ'd or expected. This has been the only Conſequence of the warm handling of this Controverſy not long ſince. And I don't doubt but the more it is canvaſs'd, the more Peoples Eyes will be open'd in our favour; and therefore I

am

am not displeas'd some go about to revive the Dispute again.

I only wish a more impartial and learned Examination of these Matters might be seriously enter'd on; for 'tis highly necessary, Points of this nature shou'd be determin'd if possible. And, I think, it lies on our Adversarys, either to renounce their Error, or else to justify themselves more solidly, by setting things in another light.

I shou'd be heartily glad if some amicable Measures might be concerted, in order to compose the Difference, and put an end to the Dispute. Perhaps it is not a Design altogether impracticable, and I am sure it wou'd be very useful if it shou'd be manag'd in that becoming manner, in which we are convinc'd by a late glorious Instance, I mean that of the *Union*, that the most nice and difficult Points may be treated and adjusted with Success. But 'tis observ'd, Ecclesiasticks are too often subject to the same Passions with other Men.

In the mean time let us examine Mr. *Wall*'s Attempt, which I have own'd is the most considerable of any thing I have seen of the kind: for he has amass'd together the Substance of all that can with any Shew of Reason be insisted on; and thus he lays his Scheme.

He first very freely allows (and indeed what unprejudic'd Man wou'd venture to assert the contrary?) that it cannot be made appear from the Scriptures that Infants are to be baptiz'd. For in the Commission, Matt. xxviii. 19. * *There is no particular direction given what to do with reference to the Children of those that receiv'd the Faith.* Nor is there in any other Place, † *among all the Persons that are recorded as baptiz'd by the Apostles,*

* *Preface*, pag. 3. † Ibid.

expres

expreſs mention of any Infant. And the Proofs drawn by conſequence from ſome Places of Scripture, are not ſo plain, as to hinder the Arguments drawn from other Places for the other ſide, from ſeeming ſtill conſiderable. All which is, in ſhort, to grant that Infant-Baptiſm cannot be prov'd from Scripture. To ballance which, he likewiſe ſuppoſes it cannot be prov'd they were not to be baptiz'd.

This is his firſt Poſition, and the Ground of the whole Superſtructure. For hence he infers in the next Place, that recourſe muſt be had to ſome other means, which may ſerve to clear up and interpret the Law, and fix the Senſe, which he thinks is not ſo free from Ambiguity as it ought to be.

In order to this he propoſes theſe Two as the only Expedients: 1. To enquire || *what was the State of the* Jewiſh *Religion, as to Baptiſm, at and before that time, when our* SAVIOUR *gave his Order for baptizing all Nations.* 2. *To learn as well as we can, how the firſt Chriſtians did practiſe in this matter; whether they baptiz'd their Infants or not.* Now if our Author can ſhew that the *Jews* did, before and at the time of CHRIST's ſending out his Diſciples, baptize the Infants of their Proſelites; and that the Primitive Church immediately after the Apoſtles time, did likewiſe uſe to baptize the Infants of Chriſtian Parents; he thinks that Practice ſufficiently prov'd to have been inſtituted by CHRIST.

And, tho there is no neceſſity for it, we might well enough venture to put the matter upon this Iſſue with him, that when he or any one elſe ſhall be able to prove theſe two Points, or indeed either of 'em, we ſhou'd unite our ſelves to the Eſtabliſh'd Church, and immediately own we have

|| *Introd.* pag. 2. med.

been

been hitherto miſtaken: which however is too much to promiſe on this ſingle Condition; tho I am fully perſwaded 'tis impoſſible for any Man to fulfil it. That our Author has not done it, I ſhall ſhow you hereafter; and in the mean time I will make a Reflection or two, which I think will take off the Force of all he ſays to eſtabliſh his general Concluſion, *viz.* that CHRIST commanded to baptize Infants; even upon the Suppoſition that he proves theſe two Particulars ever ſo ſolidly.

And firſt, you may be pleas'd to obſerve his Conceſſion, which is a very unhappy one for him: for indeed it does moſt effectually ruin the Cauſe he aſſerts; it being an unavoidable Conſequence from it, maugre all his other Attempts, that Infant-Baptiſm is no Inſtitution of CHRIST: and if ſo, tho all the *Jews* and Fathers in the World have practis'd and maintain'd it ever ſo laboriouſly, we ſhall not think our ſelves under any Obligation on that account to do ſo too; becauſe we profeſs not to be followers of them, but of CHRIST alone.

St. *Cyprian*, the darling Author of our warmeſt Adverſarys, and the antienteſt Patron of Infant Baptiſm, has a very remarkable Paſſage to this Effect, which is worth tranſcribing. Some in his time made ſo free with the other Sacrament, as to preſume to uſe Water only inſtead of Wine; for which too it ſeems they pleaded Antiquity. And the Father anſwers 'em thus: *If in that Sacrifice which* CHRIST *offer'd, none but* CHRIST *is to be follow'd, then certainly we ought to obey* CHRIST, *and do what he commanded us to do; ſince he ſays in the Goſpel*, If ye do what I command you, henceforth I call you not Servants but Friends. *And that* CHRIST *only is to be obey'd, even the* FATHER *witneſſes from Heaven, ſaying,*

ſaying, This is my beloved SON in whom I am well pleas'd; hear ye him. *Wherefore, if* CHRIST *only is to be our Guide, we are not to regard what ſome others before us have raſhly preſum'd to do, but only what* CHRIST, *who is before all, firſt practis'd. We are not to follow the Cuſtoms of Men, but the Truth of* GOD; *for* GOD *ſpeaking by the Prophet* Iſaiah *ſays*: In vain do they worſhip me, teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men. And a little after he concludes, 'tis very dangerous *to change any thing by human Traditions, from what it was at firſt by divine Inſtitution.*

But it will be expected I ſhou'd make out the Concluſion I drew from our Author's Conceſſion. I don't deſire to take any thing for granted which I can imagine may be in the leaſt doubted of, even by any Man who wou'd be thought reaſonable.

Mr. *Wall* confeſſes, all the Paſſages in Scripture relate to the Baptiſm of Adult Perſons, and gives this as a Reaſon why the Anti-pædobaptiſts are ſo ſucceſsful in their publick Diſputations. * *Having plain Places of Scripture*, ſays he, *to produce concerning Adult Baptiſm, and ſeveral Examples of it; they work much on ſuch of the People as had not minded this before, and had not had a right State of the Queſtion between the Pædo-baptiſts and the Antipædo-baptiſts: wherein the former grant that in a Nation newly converted to Chriſtianity (and ſuch are all the Caſes mention'd in Scripture) the Adult People muſt be baptiz'd firſt, before their Infants can be baptiz'd.* But this he ſuppoſes is no Proof that therefore their Infants were not to be baptiz'd at all.

---

* Part II. pag. 276.

To this let us add what I cited before, where he allows, first, *That there is no where any particular direction given what they were to do in reference to the Children of those that receiv'd the Faith, whether they shou'd be baptiz'd or not:* And secondly, *That among all the Persons that are recorded as baptiz'd by the Apostles, there is no express mention of any Infant.* And the Consequence from the whole put together must be very strong, that even upon his own Principles, there is as little ground for Infant-Baptism in the Scriptures, as there is for any thing whatever, of which that sacred Rule is totally silent.

Nay on the contrary, and as he himself proposes the matter, the Advantage lies considerably against him on our side; the great Evidence and Plainness of the Truth, which renders it so obvious to every Man, obliging him to confess, that there are in the Scriptures many plain Places and Examples which make entirely for Adult Baptism, while no single Passage can be found there, which even he himself dares say, makes plainly for the Baptism of Infants, who are not so much as once mention'd where Baptism is spoken of.

Now to say that in proselyted Nations the Adult are first to be baptiz'd; and that all the Cases in Scripture are of this kind; and that therefore all the Passages of Scripture which speak of Baptism, are to be understood particularly of Adult Baptism; and farther, that there is no Example nor Direction of any kind, that Infants ever were or ought to be baptiz'd: What is all this but a full and explicit Confession that the Scriptures are wholly silent in this matter, and know nothing of Infant-Baptism at all?

But because this wou'd be granting too much, our Author, to moderate the Force of it, supposes (and indeed it is at best but a Supposition)

in ſome general Expreſſions Infants are to be included, as in the Commiſſion, *Matt.* xxviii. 19. and perhaps other Paſſages elſewhere, and *Joh.* iii. 5. which he reckons * the plaineſt Argument for Infant-Baptiſm, and, with the antient Pædobaptiſts, the chief Ground of it. But to affirm Infants are intended as well as Adult in theſe and ſuch like Places, is begging the Queſtion, and aſſerting the Thing inſtead of proving it.

It's true, Mr. *Wall*, to do him juſtice, has not done ſo; but ſparing the Aſſertion, he wou'd ſeem to propoſe it as a thing in it ſelf a little doubtful, and therefore goes about to clear it up from the Practice of the *Jews* and Primitive Chriſtians; which however we ſhall ſee hereafter make nothing for him.

In the mean time, unleſs he can ſhew us, at leaſt by good Conſequence, that Infant-Baptiſm is ſo much as mention'd in the Scriptures, we ſhan't believe it is inſtituted there, tho we are told it ever ſo often. But whatever may be pretended at other times, thus much moſt plainly and neceſſarily follows from, or rather is the very Senſe of our Author's Words above-cited, *viz.* That as to Infant-Baptiſm in particular, the Scriptures are wholly ſilent; and all he pretends is, not that he ſees it by any neceſſary Inference, but only that *probably* it may be comprehended in ſome of the more general Paſſages: that is in ſhort, they are fully reſolv'd to find it ſomewhere; but I think it much more *probable*, that if it had been an Inſtitution of CHRIST, it wou'd have been mention'd in ſome Paſſage of holy Writ, as well as we ſee Adult Baptiſm frequently is. However, we are not to take up with Suppoſitions and bare Aſſertions, and therefore if our Antagoniſts wou'd

* Part II. pag. 122.

convince

convince us, they must not surmise, but plainly shew us that Infant-Baptism is indeed contain'd in the Scriptures; for if it is not there, we regard no other Authority, and therefore shall not think our selves much concern'd to account for our rejecting it.

I shou'd not have insisted on this so long, but only that it shews, Mr. *Wall* has ruin'd his whole design, by what he lays down at first; for if Infant-Baptism can't be found in Scripture, as he confesses, then it ought not to be practis'd, especially in the stead, and to the excluding of that which is plainly instituted in it.

You may remember, Sir, that our Author wou'd allow of no other way to determine the Sense of the *Greek* Word βαπτίζω, than by observing how it was us'd in the Scripture. So that when he fansys it may be serviceable to him, the Scripture must be the only Rule even of Language. 'Tis the Rule we know of our Faith and Practice, and was design'd for that; but not to be the Standard of Speech, which is continually altering, and depends upon Custom. If Mr. *Wall* therefore will needs have us refer our selves entirely to the Scriptures for the Sense of a Word, 'tis much more reasonable, I hope, to determine all Controversys by 'em, that relate to the Christian Religion, which is instituted by God, and contain'd in those sacred Books. If Infant-Baptism then is not to be found in Scripture, no Christian is oblig'd to practise it. This Inference is drawn wholly from Mr. *Wall*'s own Premises, and therefore I take it for an unanswerable Argument, at least *ad hominem*, as they call it.

And farther, this Topic proves not only that we are not oblig'd to practise the Baptizing of Infants; but on the contrary, that 'tis unlawful to do it. The Case of the *Jews* was

parallel; of whom CHRIST ſays, *Matt.* xv. 16. *Thus have ye made the Commandments of* GOD *of none effect by your Traditions:* and afterwards applies to 'em theſe Words of the Prophet, *But in vain do they worſhip me, teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men. For* (as St. *Mark* vii. 8. adds) *laying aſide the Commandment of* GOD, *ye hold the Traditions of Men, as the Waſhing of Pots and Cups: and many other ſuch like things ye do.* Nay theſe Words are much more ſevere upon the Pædobaptiſts now, than they were upon the *Jews* then; for they had the Command of GOD for Waſhing of Cups, *&c.* in ſome Caſes; and this Waſhing of Cups, *&c.* did not joſtle out any other religious Duty: whereas the Pædobaptiſts have not the leaſt Countenance from GOD for Infant-Baptiſm at all, which has nevertheleſs, thro the prevailing Power of Cuſtom and Intereſt, too generally, but it is to be hop'd not paſt all probability of recovery, ſuperſeded the one Primitive, True, Apoſtolical Baptiſm, of which only 'tis confeſs'd the Scripture ſpeaks, *viz.* that of Adult Perſons upon Profeſſion of their Faith: which is a thing very rarely ſeen or heard of now in the greateſt Part of the Chriſtian World, their Traditionary Pædobaptiſm being ſubſtituted in its room.

Methinks the Gentlemen, our Antagoniſts, whoſe Authority and Example, I muſt ſay, *delude* the People (who generally plead nothing elſe but the Authority of their Spiritual Guides in defence of this Practice) into this Error, ſhou'd more cloſely conſider thoſe awful Words of St. *Paul*, *Gal* i. 9. *If any Man preach any other Goſpel unto you than that you have receiv'd, let him be accurſed.* A dreadful Sentence, and not pronounc'd in vain! And CHRIST Himſelf has promis'd to confirm the Sentence of His Apoſtles, *John* xx. 23. *Whoſoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted*

remitted unto them; and whosesoever Sins ye retain, they are retained. They wou'd do well to consider, whether teaching a different, that is, another Baptism from that which is so plainly taught in the Scriptures, does not fall under this *Anathema*. For my part, I can't but think, the teaching and practising any thing not contain'd in Scripture, as a Commandment of GOD; especially if it sets aside something that is plainly to be found there; must, at least, in some measure, seem to fall under the Condemnation in these Words, unless where Ignorance may be pleaded in Excuse.

Such as are true Friends to the Protestant Cause, ought always to have particular regard to that which is the chief Corner-Stone in its Foundation; which is, to have no other Rule of Faith, or Judg of Controversys, beside the Sacred Word of GOD. For if once we admit of any other, we directly give up our Cause, and expose our selves to all the Impositions and Inconveniencys which are the inseparable Attendants of Popery.

This our most Reverend and Wise Reformers knew perfectly well, and therefore piously us'd all Endeavours to have the Bible, as the best Rule, publish'd in the *English* Tongue; but not without the violent and powerful Opposition of the Partisans of *Rome*, who knew it was the most effectual way to ruin their Kingdom of Darkness and Superstition, in which they had such considerable Interests. It has but an odd Aspect then, for any here among us, to offer to advance another Rule besides the Scriptures, in matters of this kind; tho perhaps they mayn't intend or see the ill Consequences of it; and I wou'd hope and believe they don't: yet still, to imitate the Actions of those who at first *per fas & nefas* oppos'd our glorious and happy Reformation, seems, at least, to

beſpeak, that thoſe who do ſo are much in the ſame Intereſt, as to the Point of Tradition at leaſt.

But all I will at preſent infer from it, ſhall be only the Inconſiſtency of our Antagoniſts Principles in rejecting Tradition, and appealing to the Bible, as the ſole Authority, when they diſpute againſt the Papiſts; and in building at the ſame time the Baptiſm of Infants, only on the pretended Tradition of the Church. That is, they will diſcard Tradition when 'tis againſt 'em; but if it will ſerve to ſupport any particular Doctrine or Uſage they are fond of, then it muſt be admitted.

Our Author at his Ordination, in the moſt ſolemn manner, declar'd upon Oath his free and full Aſſent to the Articles of the Church of *England*; and therefore I may take them for unconteſtable Principles with him, and indeed with the whole Clergy of that Church. Now, the 6th Article, you know, Sir, declares, *That whatſoever is not read therein*, (viz. in the holy Scriptures) *nor may be prov'd thereby, is not to be requir'd of any Man, that it ſhou'd be believ'd as an Article of Faith, or be thought requiſite or neceſſary to Salvation.* The Words of the learned Biſhop of *Sarum*, on this Paſſage, which he indeed aims againſt the Church of *Rome*, are ſo applicable to another Church too, in reference to the Point in controverſy between Her and Us, that I ſhall take leave to tranſcribe ſome of 'em. *If this is our Rule*, ſays his Lordſhip, *our entire and only Rule, then ſuch Doctrines as are not in it, ought to be rejected; and any Church that adds to the Chriſtian Religion, is erroneous for making ſuch Additions*, &c. *So all the Additions of the five Sacraments, of the Invocation of Angels and Saints*, &c. *of the corporeal Preſence in the Euchariſt*, &c. *with a great many more, are certainly*

tainly Errors, unless they can be prov'd from Scripture.

And so likewise is Pædobaptism, which Mr. *Wall* confesses can't be prov'd from Scripture: and what the Right Reverend Bishop adds, is as true of this as of any of those Errors he has mention'd; of which he says, *they are intolerable Errors, if as the Scripture is express in opposition to them, so they defile the Worship of Christians* (I forbear to add, as his Lordship does, *with Idolatry*) *But they become most intolerable, if they are impos'd upon all that are in that Communion; and if Creeds or Oaths, in which they are affirm'd, are requir'd of all in their Communion. Here is the main ground of justifying our forming our selves into a distinct Body from the* Roman *Church; and therefore it is well to be consider'd.*

His Lordship very necessarily added these last Words; and 'tis great pity that Matter is so little consider'd: For had it been more strictly observ'd, the Reformation wou'd have been long since carried to a much higher degree of Perfection, and every evil Work, and every thing which offends, taken away: Whereas the want of adhering to *the main Ground* of the Reformation, has unhappily afforded the *Romish* Party an Opportunity to give it some terrible Shocks.

They have often, and with great Advantage, argu'd from Infant-Baptism; which, they strongly assert, is only grounded on the Tradition of the Church; and therefore will always remain an unanswerable Argument for Tradition, against all such as admit of that Practice. To this the reform'd Divines have yet never made any solid Answer; and those Passages which Mr. *Stennett*, in answer to *Russen*, has translated from the ingenious Monsieur *Bossuet*, will be a standing unanswerable Objection to the Pædobaptist Protestants, and cannot be solv'd, but by flinging up Infant-

Baptiſm, or elſe by ſhewing it to be founded on Scripture, which nevertheleſs, 'tis confeſs'd, can't be done: And the Anonymous Anſwer to the Biſhop of *Meaux* ingenuouſly acknowledges, that *the Paſſages produc'd, do at moſt only prove, that it is permitted, or rather, that it is not forbidden* to baptize Infants.

And who now wou'd imagine, that Proteſtants ſhou'd ſo generally, and that too after they have been often reminded of it by the moſt learned Prelates, and others of the *Romiſh* Communion, their Adverſarys, ſtill continue to practiſe what is ſo well demonſtrated to be erroneous, I may ſay unlawful; eſpecially ſince it gives the *Romaniſts* ſuch a Handle to purſue this Example on their ſide, in eſtabliſhing what Corruptions they pleaſe, and abrogating any of our SAVIOUR's Laws? For their Inference is undoubtedly very juſt, that if Tradition and the Church's Authority be a ſufficient ground for altering one Sacrament, it muſt likewiſe be ſufficient to juſtify any Changes made in the other, tho it be the denying the Cup to the Laiety: and 'twill be a ſufficient warrant alſo to introduce as many other Sacraments as they think fit to invent: and thus Confirmation, Penance, Extreme Unction, Ordination, and Matrimony, are prov'd to be as properly and truly Sacraments, as the Two which CHRIST inſtituted, *viz.* Baptiſm and the Euchariſt.

But our prudent Reformers, in order to deliver us effectually, and prevent all after Attempts from the *Romiſh* Church, made it a Fundamental Article of their new Conſtitution, which all the Clergy at leaſt are oblig'd indiſpenſably to give their free Aſſent to upon Oath, That Traditions, *&c.* are not to be admitted as a Rule.

The whole 6th Article, 'tis plain, and more directly thoſe Words a little before tranſcrib'd, were

were intended, as my Lord of *Salisbury* does yet more fully explain and apply 'em, againſt that dangerous Error of the *Romiſh* Church, which is, as it were, the Foundation of all the reſt. This Article declares againſt ſetting up any other Rule of Faith, of any kind whatever, in competition with the Canonical Books of the Old and New Teſtament: and all who enter into Orders do forſwear any other.

But how Mr. *Wall*, or any Man who owns Infant-Baptiſm cannot be maintain'd but by the Traditions of the Church, and yet practiſes it; I ſay, how any ſuch Perſon can excuſe himſelf of Prevarication, or ſomething worſe, is what I can't divine. I believe if Mr. *Wall* was to attempt it, he wou'd find the Difficulty not eaſily ſurmounted. In the mean time, I think it's plain enough, that even the Articles of that very Church our Author defends, condemn and diſallow his Method, which nevertheleſs he thinks is the only one whereby he can hope to defend Pædobaptiſm.

But all this is only arguing *ad Hominem ab abſurdo*. Suffer me now to offer ſome few Obſervations which naturally ariſe from the Silence of the Sacred Scriptures, and may ſerve to make out yet more fully, that this is ſo far from being a fit Ground-work for Mr. *Wall* to build upon, that it is as good an Argument againſt him as can reaſonably be deſir'd.

All Chriſtians pay ſo high a Veneration to the Scripture, that, where they have the liberty to expreſs their Thoughts, they appeal to it as the only Guide in all Points of Religion. All Partys are ſo convinc'd of the Sufficiency and Authority of it, that they are concern'd to fouud their Opinions, tho ever ſo miſtaken, upon it; and never think 'em ſafe, till ſome Texts or other are brought

brought to ſpeak in their favour. Our Experience may ſatisfy us, whatever Reaſonings and Arguments are employ'd to ſupport any thing, we are apt to raiſe Scruples and Doubts, if we don't ſee it confirm'd by holy Writ.

And in the Nature of the Thing, it muſt be ſo: For the Scriptures being the Records of reveal'd Religion, nothing can be our Duty but what they enjoin; and conſequently, we are to take no notice of what is not expreſs'd in 'em.

All Laws in general are underſtood to bind only in relation to the Particulars ſeverally ſpecify'd in 'em. This is ſelf-evident; and 'tis too abſurd to be made ſo much as a Suppoſition, that they are obligatory in Caſes they have no relation to, and which they don't ſo much as mention. An Act which makes it Treaſon to contrive the Death of a King, does not at the ſame time make it equally Capital to contrive the Death of the meaneſt Subject; but on the contrary, rather ſuppoſes the latter not to be equally Capital. Had it mention'd Beggars too, or been put in ſuch general Expreſſions as comprehended them, or all Men, then the Caſe wou'd have been the ſame: but one Caſe being mention'd and not the other, makes one Criminal and the other not; one being againſt an expreſs Law, which has no relation to the other.

All Commiſſions, and Warrants, *&c.* do as it were appropriate the Dutys or Privileges they impoſe or grant, only to thoſe Perſons and Circumſtances ſeverally therein mention'd; and at the ſame time tacitly imply, they are not to be conſtru'd as obliging any other Perſons, or even the ſame in other Circumſtances than thoſe expreſs'd. For when any Powers ſpecify ſome Particulars, they are underſtood to relate to thoſe only, and to exclude all others. All Grants and Gifts, whether by the Crown, or any other Authority, are made

made to this or the other particular Person or Family; and the bare mentioning of them is a sufficient cutting off all other Pretences whatever. The commissioning Judges to try such and such Causes, is not only not authorizing 'em to judg other Causes, but a tacit forbidding 'em to do it: For tho the Commission gives a Power to judg and determine, 'tis understood to be with this Restriction, *viz.* only the things mention'd; so far it gives Power to go; but it does not give, which is the same as to with-hold or refuse, the Power to go farther. And accordingly, 'tis accounted Criminal, and a high Contempt of the Superior Authority, to exceed the Bounds of a Commission, barely in doing what it does not mention. From all this I think 'tis more than sufficiently plain, that the Silence of a Lawgiver, *&c.* in any Case, is understood to be a Prohibition against the said Things he is silent in, especially if some other Particulars be express'd, and that omitted; for then it looks as if 'twere design'd, and has therefore something more negative in it.

'Tis a sure Maxim of * *Tertullian*, *Negat Scriptura quod non notat.* A Maxim so fatal to the Causes which depend on Tradition, that *le Prieure* cou'd not safely pass it by, without boldly accusing this antient Writer of Heterodoxy.

To apply this to our present Dispute: Since the Scripture, in all the places where it speaks of Baptism, is confess'd to speak only of Adult Persons, and never once to mention Infants; one wou'd think it shou'd be an unavoidable Consequence, that therefore the Adult only which are mention'd, and not Infants which are not, shou'd be look'd upon as fit Subjects of Baptism. If Adult

* De Monogam. *pag.* 527.

Baptism

Baptiſm only be mention'd in Scripture, then Infant-Baptiſm to be ſure cannot be grounded upon that Sacred Law: And to draw a home Inference, it muſt be unlawful to baptize Infants under pretence of divine Authority, and as by Commiſſion from CHRIST; ſince it appears to be contrary to, or at leaſt different from, his Intention, which was, that Adult Perſons ſhou'd be baptiz'd: and, as appears from the frequent mention of Adult, and the total Silence about Infants, that this Sacred Ordinance ſhou'd not be profan'd, by admitting ſuch unfit Subjects to it.

This negative Concluſion muſt be as ſtrong here as in all other ſuch-like Caſes. So the Patent by which his Grace was created Duke of *Marlborough*, and the Settlements made for the ſutable Support of the ſaid Dignity, are an honourable Acknowledgment of his invincible Courage, and wiſe Conduct, and of his unſhaken Loyalty and Faithfulneſs, and indefatigable Induſtry in the Service of his Queen and Country, and the whole Proteſtant Intereſt. The bare mentioning his Grace, together with his Heirs, without mentioning any other, appropriates this Honour to his Grace's Family only, and to his Heir after him, who alone, of all the Children, wou'd be entitl'd to the Honour, notwithſtanding the reſt are not expreſly mention'd, and denied it: And the Reaſon which excludes the reſt, is only becauſe they are not mention'd in the Patent; and ſo, exactly on the ſame account, Infants are not to be baptiz'd, *viz.* becauſe they are not mention'd in thoſe Clauſes of our Scripture-Patent which relate to the high Privilege of Baptiſm. Again, every Man of but common Senſe will allow, that all Obligations bind only thoſe Perſons who are mention'd, and upon thoſe Conditions only which are expreſs'd. If I am bound in a Bond of Ten thouſand Pounds for

for my Friend's Fidelity in any Poſt; I ſhall not be accountable on any other Pretence, as of his unfitneſs for the Place, or the like; nor is any other Perſon anſwerable for his Frauds, *&c.* no other Condition being mention'd in the Bond beſide his Fidelity, nor no other Man made a Joint-Security with me.

Juſt for the ſame reaſon to a tittle, we think Baptiſm ſhou'd not be adminiſter'd to Infants: for 'tis beyond Diſpute, that the only Perſons mention'd in the *Baptiſmal Clauſes* of Scripture, are the Adult, and the only Condition, Faith and Repentance. By all which, Infants ſeem to have been as deſignedly excluded this Sacrament, as cou'd well be. And tho the Inference in this particular Caſe will be pinching, and therefore ungrateful enough to our Author; he will nevertheleſs readily allow, in ſome Caſes which agree with his Syſtem, that negative Arguments are not always invalid.

On ſome Occaſions which might be pointed at, I know he wou'd ſubſcribe Dr. *Whitby*'s general Rule, That † *in matters of Doctrine, the Argument is always good: We read of no ſuch Doctrine in the* Scriptures, *therefore it neither is, nor can be any* Article of Faith, *becauſe we have no other Rule of Faith beſides the* holy Scriptures. The Doctor's Reaſon makes the Obſervation appear certainly true, and therefore gives the Cauſe of Pædobaptiſm a more deadly Wound.

And indeed, 'tis mainly on this Foundation the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy is at preſent built, for the appointing Officers in the Church to adminiſter the Sacraments, for inſtance, our Author himſelf, and almoſt all Chriſtians will allow, is a tacit Pro-

† *Annot. in Matth.* vi. 9. pag. 58. a.

hibition,

hibition, that no other Perſon preſume to do it. In like manner, the mentioning the Adult in the Commiſſion to baptize, and not Infants alſo, is as ſtrong a Prohibition not to baptize the latter.

When we were laſt together, you may remember, Sir, you took occaſion to intimate, that probably Mr. *Wall* wou'd not ſtick to reject this way of arguing, if any ſhou'd urge it upon him. But I obſerve, when he writ his Hiſtory, he had ſo good an opinion of it, as to uſe it himſelf. For when he has made the Suppoſition, that the *Jews* did baptize their Proſelytes together with their Children; and that our LORD transfer'd that Practice from them into the Chriſtian Church; he adds, to clinch the Nail he has been driving, and infer Infants muſt now in like manner be baptiz'd, ‖ *If our* SAVIOUR *meant that the Apoſtles ſhou'd make any Alteration in that Matter, and not baptize the Infants as had been uſually done, it is a wonder He did not ſay ſo.* Placing the Streſs of the Matter in this, that the Scripture is wholly ſilent as to our LORD's giving a Direction to make any Alteration in this Point.

He ſpeaks much after the ſame manner, and in the ſame Caſe too, when he allows, that notwithſtanding what he had ſaid, Baptiſm * *ought to be regulated by the Practice of* John, *and of* CHRIST *Himſelf, rather than by any preceding Cuſtom of the* Jewiſh *Nation; if we had any good ground to believe that they did, in the Caſe of Infants, differ, or alter any thing from the uſual way: But we have no kind of Proof that they made any ſuch Alteration.* Here again he argues from the Scripture's Silence, and therefore my Inference will ſtand good againſt

‖ *Introd.* pag. 15. * Ib. pag. 19.

him,

him, That indeed Infants might be baptiz'd *if we had any good ground to believe* that CHRIST and His Apostles baptiz'd any: *but we have no kind of Proof* that they baptiz'd any; and *if our* SAVIOUR *meant that the Apostles* shou'd have done it, *'tis a wonder He did not say so.*

But certainly, as we had no Power to baptize at all without His Command; so neither have we Power to baptize any, but *such* as He commanded: and those you have already seen, Sir, Mr. *Wall* himself allows to be the Adult only, as far as the Scriptures can go to inform us of the matter.

Against all this, there is a miserable Cavil, very common in the Mouths of Pædobaptists, which one wou'd think Men of the most ordinary Capacitys cou'd not persuade themselves to use, *viz.* They observe, that CHRIST has no where forbid 'em to baptize Infants, and therefore they infer they ought not to neglect it. This is so very trifling, that I don't know whether you will excuse me for taking notice of it. However, 'tis of such Weight with some People, and our Author himself has recourse to it so frequently, that it is necessary just to touch on it.

The Proposition is this: CHRIST *has no where forbid us to baptize our Children.* But, first, all that will follow from thence, at best, is only, that it is in it self, simply consider'd, lawful to sprinkle or dip Children, when and how we please: but it can in no wise be infer'd, that we *ought* to do so; no nor that it is lawful to do it as a religious Ceremony, or a thing appointed by CHRIST: nor will it at all follow, that this may be boldly substituted in the place of what our LORD did ordain. CHRIST has not indeed forbid us to bathe our selves every Day, and therefore it is certainly lawful to do it: but if we do it as a part of divine Worship, and impose it on others as such,

we

we become inexcuſably guilty of Superſtition, and the worſt kind of Tyranny.

Mr. *Wall* himſelf has noted out of *Epiphanius*, that 'tis one of *Marcion*'s Errors, to teach, that ſuch religious Purification by Baptiſm may lawfully be repeated. Many humane Inventions may doubtleſs be very lawfully practis'd as ſuch, becauſe they are not either directly or indirectly prohibited in Scripture; but if they are impos'd as divine Inſtitutions, the Reaſon ceaſes, and they are no longer lawful: for tho they may not be particularly mention'd, yet CHRIST does expreſly enough condemn 'em in that general Cenſure of the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, for *teaching as Doctrines the Commandments of Men*. And whatever may be rank'd under the *Commandments of Men*, and belong to that Denomination, cannot plead the Scripture's Silence in their Favour, but are here moſt directly and expreſly condemn'd.

So that tho we ſhou'd allow it lawful, merely in compliance with the Cuſtoms of a Country, to ſprinkle Children for their Health, ſuppoſe, or on account of any other Civil Ceremony, becauſe as ſuch, 'tis no where forbidden; I ſee no Inconvenience in it. But then this Reaſon will not hold if they ſhou'd urge it, as the Pædobaptiſts do, as an Ordinance of CHRIST; for the Scripture is not ſilent in this Caſe, but on the contrary, explicitly againſt ſuch Preſumptions, as aſcribing Inventions to the divine Will.

Tertullian, on another Occaſion, well expoſes the Weakneſs of this way of arguing. Some in his time pleaded for the lawfulneſs of wearing a Military Crown, which the *Romans* gave their Soldiers who had diſtinguiſh'd themſelves by ſome extraordinary Action, and thought they might continue to wear it after their Converſion to Chriſtianity; and if any found fault, they preſently recur'd to

our

our Author's Subterfuge, that the Scriptures no where forbid 'em to do ſo. † *It's an eaſy matter,* ſays *Tertullian, to demand where it is written, we may not wear the Crown? But then too, where is it written, we may? For thoſe who require their Adverſarys to produce Scripture-Authority, conclude by it, that their own Cauſe ſhou'd be ſupported by the ſame. If 'tis lawful therefore to wear the Crown, becauſe the Scripture no where forbids it; it may with equal Force be retorted, that 'tis therefore not lawful, becauſe the Scripture does no where command it. What then muſt be done in this Caſe? Muſt both be allow'd, becauſe neither is forbidden? Or, Muſt both be rejected, becauſe neither is commanded? You'll ſay, perhaps, what is not prohibited, is therefore allow'd: No, 'tis forbidden by not being expreſly allow'd.*

If *Tertullian*'s Reaſoning here ſhou'd not hold as to things in their own nature indifferent; he muſt however be blind indeed, that does not ſee how ſtrongly it holds in all religious matters, which it may be pretended we ought, or ought not to do. In ſhort, all that can be made of their Argument is, that as they have nothing for their Practice in the Scriptures, ſo there is nothing againſt it: As much as to ſay, we have no reaſon to oppoſe the Practice; and they have no reaſon to plead for it. But whether we have

† *Lib. de Corona, cap.* 2. *pag.* 101. Et facile eſt ſtatim exigere, ubi ſcriptum ſit, ne coronemur? At enim ubi ſcriptum eſt, ut coronemur? Expoſtulantes enim Scripturæ Patrocinium in Parte diverſa, præjudicant ſuæ quoque Parti Scripturæ Patrocinium adeſſe debere. Nam ſi ideo dicetur coronari licere quia non prohibeat Scriptura, æque retorquebitur, ideo coronari non licere, quia Scriptura non jubeat. Quid faciet Diſciplina? Utrumque recipiet, quaſi neutrum prohibitum ſit? An utrumque rejiciet, quaſi neutrum præceptum ſit? Sed quod non prohibetur, ultro permiſſum eſt. Immo prohibetur quod non ultro eſt permiſſum.

reaſon to oppoſe 'em, let all Men judg; if they have no reaſon to urge for their Practice, their Cauſe is bad enough: for, as Mr. *Lock* ſomewhere ſays, *He that believes without having any reaſon for believing, may be in love with his own Fancys; but neither ſeeks Truth as he ought, nor pays the Obedience due to his* MAKER.

'Twou'd be thought extravagant in any Man to pretend, ſuch a Clod in a certain Field is the ſelf-ſame Piece of Earth which about 6000 Years ago was *Adam*'s Body, becauſe the Scripture does not ſay the contrary. As wild as this appears to be, 'tis however as juſt as the Pædobaptiſt's Plea, and muſt be allow'd ſo, for it's grounded on the ſame Reaſon, *viz.* that the Scripture no where ſays the contrary.

2. In the next place, you may pleaſe to obſerve, that tho in ſome Caſes the Scripture's Silence may leave the thing indifferent, to the freedom or opinion of every Man; yet 'tis far from being ſo always. Things in their own nature indifferent, may be left ſo well enough; but it is not an indifferent matter whether we obey GOD and CHRIST or not, and perform divine Service according to his Will and Appointment. And therefore the Scripture's Silence cannot be pleaded here with any reaſon at all. They don't forbid us, in ſo many Words expreſly, to give the Sacramental Supper to a *Turk*; but who will therefore infer, he may? Why does not our Author baptize Perſons after they are dead, to waſh 'em from all Sins committed in their Life-time, ſince the Scripture does not expreſly forbid him to baptize ſuch; nor any where declare Perſons ſo baptiz'd ſhall not be perfectly cleans'd and forgiven?

Again; where does the Scripture tell us in Terms, the Roman is not the only true Catholick Church?

Church? That Oral Tradition may not entirely be depended on? That the Doctrine of Sacramental Justification is a mischievous Error? as the learned Bishop of *Salisbury* nevertheless justly calls it; and argues, as I have hitherto done, in direct contradiction to our Author's way, That * *Since this is no where mention'd in all the large Discourses that are in the New Testament concerning Justification, we have just reason to reject it.* Pilgrimages, and all kinds of Penance, *&c.* stand upon the same bottom. But to give an Instance something nearer to the matter in hand; we are no where forbid to baptize our Cattle, Bells, Tables, *&c.* but yet our Author, I hope, wou'd never infer that they *may*, much less that they *ought* to be baptiz'd; for to administer the Sacraments to visibly unfit Subjects, is no better than an impious profanation of 'em.

Now from all this, instead of a great deal more which might easily be added, it clearly appears, if our Author argues well, and the Scripture's Silence be a sufficient reason for a thing, that he ought in Honour and Conscience to return to *Rome*; that's the least he can do. Nay, all the silly Trumpery of *Rome*, the Antient as well as the Modern, may be brought into play again by this one single Topick, which manifestly opens a Door to all the Inventions of every fanciful Brain, which has but the Luck to hit on such odd Notions as the Scriptures do not expresly contradict.

I suppose, Sir, you may have seen, when you were at *Padua*, the Sermon which good St. *Anthony* is said to have preach'd to a Congregation of Fishes, in one of his flaming Fits of Devotion: And since the Scripture no where forbids to

* Expos. Article 11. *p.* 125.

preach to Fiſhes, to Trees, to wild Beaſts, *&c.* but commands to *preach the Goſpel to every Creature*, which ſeems to have the like Colour with that which the Pædobaptiſts urge for their Tenet, why ſhou'd we laugh at St. *Anthony*'s Zeal? For, according to our Author's Rule, he was much in the right, and our Author himſelf ought to follow his Example.

I intended to have diſmiſs'd this matter in fewer Words, but 'tis inſenſibly grown under my Pen. However, of the two Extremes, I had rather allow my ſelf to be too *long*, than too *obſcure*. I am,

SIR,

Yours, *&c.*

LETTER

LETTER VII.

That the Scripture does not leave Infant-Baptism so undetermin'd as some wou'd pretend, is largely shewn from Matth. xxviii. 19. *All Laws equally oblige in all Particulars mention'd in 'em. This apply'd to our present Dispute. The Commission necessarily obliges to teach all it intends shou'd be baptiz'd. Therefore Infants cannot be included in that Commission. The Commission also requires that all of whom it speaks shou'd be first taught, and afterwards baptiz'd. The ridiculous Objection of such as say, Infants also are to be taught, answer'd. Some wou'd evade the Force, by confessing, this Commission relates peculiarly to the Adult: which is directly giving up the Argument. What the Pædobaptists urge from the Words* All Nations, *answer'd. 'Tis not said* all of all Nations. *Illustrated by a parallel Instance from* Matth. iii. 5, 6. *Mr.* Dorrington *censur'd. 'Tis prov'd, the Commission most directly excludes Infants. What the Pædobaptists urge concerning the* Greek *Word* Μαθητεύσατε, *answer'd. Dr.* Hammond *censur'd for so grosly contradicting himself in this Point. Men of the greatest Learning disown the Criticism of the Pædobaptists. A Passage from the Bishop of* Sarum. *Another from Dr.* Whitby. Μαθητεύειν *is constantly us'd to signify nothing less than* to teach, *&c. The Sense of the Word prov'd from its Etymology. The Primitive, and all its Derivatives, include* teaching, *&c. No room for an* Antiphrasis, *which is now exploded by the best Grammarians. The Pretence from the Termination, that Words in* ευω *are to be inter-*

preted by ſum *in* Latin, *is groundleſs.* Plutarch *uſes the Word to ſignify* to teach. *Another Inſtance from St.* Ignatius. *Another from the ſame. Another from the ſame. One from St.* Clemens Alexandrinus. *One from St.* Juſtin Martyr. *The Meaning of* εἰς τὸ ὄνομα. *Another Inſtance from St.* Juſtin. *The Word* μαθητεύειν, *even in its ſuppos'd Neuter Acceptation, notwithſtanding the contrary Pretences, always includes* teaching. Mat. xxvii. 57. *conſider'd. Inſtances wherein the Word ſignifys* to teach, &c. *even when conſtructed with a Dative Caſe; From* Plutarch; *From* Origen; *From St.* Ireneus, *expounded by a Paſſage of* Socrates; *and from* Clemens Alexandrinus. *The true Senſe of the Word farther illuſtrated by ſynonymous Words. Inſtances of* παιδεύω, *from* Plutarch; *From* Ælian; *From* Plato. *Inſtances of* ἀυξάω, *from* Pindar; *From* Diogenes Laertius; *From* Plutarch. *An Inſtance of* διαυξάω, *from* Plutarch. *A very remarkable Inſtance of the Senſe of* μαθητεύειν, *from* Clemens Alexandrinus. *Another from the ſame. One from* Origen. *Beſides, if what our Adverſarys advance were right, it can be of no Advantage to 'em, becauſe the Word in the Commiſſion is allow'd to be* tranſitive. *Diſcipleſhip neceſſarily includes Teaching.* Μαθητεύω *means* to teach ſucceſsfully; *and therefore is indeed conſequentially* to make Diſciples.

I Hope, Sir, I may venture to ſay, that what was urg'd in my laſt, amounts to little leſs than a Demonſtration, that 'tis the worſt Logick in the World to argue, as the Pædobaptiſts do, from the ſuppos'd Silence of the Scriptures; which I have ſhewn plainly enough is not only no Argument for Infant-Baptiſm, but on the contrary, concludes as ſtrongly againſt it, as any reaſonable Man can deſire an Argument ſhou'd do.

And

And this is the first of those Considerations, which I pretend do utterly ruin our Author's Design, even tho he shou'd prove (as we shall hereafter see he does not) that the *Jews* did use to baptize their Proselytes together with their Children, and that the Christians soon after the Apostolick Times did so too; for you will allow me, that Arguments from Scripture are of far more Force than both these.

But in the next place, I add another Consideration, of much greater Weight still, namely, that the Scripture does not leave this matter so undetermin'd as the Pædobaptists wou'd fain persuade themselves, but that it directly disallows of Infant Baptism, and admits of no other but that of Adult Persons. I once intended to have made out this, in an exact and particular Examination of all those Passages of Scripture which have or might have been pleaded on either side: but I find I am like to be tedious enough without it; and therefore I shall think 'tis sufficient to do it from *Matth.* xxviii. 19. which is indeed the main Ground and Foundation of the Ordinance, and the sole Authority and Rule, even for the holy Apostles themselves, in this matter. If I am pretty large on this, you will excuse me, because it is instead of all the rest.

To proceed then with plain and clear Evidence. I desire you to consider, that if any Law or Commission, *&c.* does enjoin, and particularly mention two or more things to be done; the said Law, *&c.* does equally oblige to the performance of each of those things, and render one as necessary and indispensable as the other, unless there be some particular Exception to the contrary. Thus the Judges, for instance, are empower'd and oblig'd to try and to give Judgment in such and such Causes: If they only hear 'em, they don't

diſcharge their Duty, but are equally oblig'd to determine and give Sentence according to Law. For the Authority which obliges to one, is equal in its Obligation with reſpect to the other.

This Notion was the Ground of that Diſſatiſfaction in the Time of K. *Char.* I. concerning the Buſineſs of *Rochel*; for all People thought thoſe Forces had been ſent to the Aſſiſtance of the Town, and therefore that they were equally oblig'd, both to go thither, and to aſſiſt the beſieg'd: But when the matter unluckily miſcarry'd, they began to think the Commanders were excus'd from aſſiſting the diſtreſs'd by contrary private Inſtructions. And what mightily confirms this Suppoſition is, that, as *Leti* remarks, * *they might with very little Danger have reliev'd the Place*; and without ſuch Inſtructions, they wou'd, as they were requir'd, have acted with more Vigour and Prudence.

But, however the Truth be, this ſerves to illuſtrate my general Rule, which I ſuppoſe will not be diſputed: and then this particular Branch of it muſt be alſo allow'd me, *viz.* that ſince the Commiſſion to baptize, mentions teaching as well as baptizing, without making any diſtinction, or ſaying any thing of one, which is not ſaid of the other; therefore this Commiſſion does equally oblige both to teach and to baptize. And upon this Principle I will ſhew you, that the Commiſſion under Conſideration cannot comprehend Infants. In order to which, I obſerve, 1. That the Words do neceſſarily oblige to teach all whom they intend ſhou'd be baptiz'd. And, 2. That

---

* Ceremonial. *Part* IV. *lib.* 5. *pag.* 411. Che potevano con poco Riſchio ſoccorer la Piazza.

this

this teaching must always as necessarily precede their being baptiz'd. Both which Articles do very plainly exclude Infants, because they are not capable of being taught at all.

1. As to the first thing, that the Institution does indispensibly enjoin, that all who are to be baptiz'd, must likewise be taught; this is evident, if you observe, that the Command, in both its parts, is equally and universally apply'd to all those Subjects which are mention'd therein, and are denoted by that comprehensive Phrase, *all Nations*. For there is no manner of distinction or difference made between some and others of this Aggregate. This will more certainly appear, if we resolve the Proposition Logically. The only Subjects spoken of, are *all Nations:* The Things said of these Subjects are, that they must be taught, and that they must be baptiz'd. Now both these being said of the same Subjects, we may form the Words into these two Propositions, for they are virtually two, *viz. Teach all Nations*, and *Baptize all Nations*. The Steps I take are easy and sure, according to the Method in use among Mathematicians, than which nothing can be more plain and conclusive; and therefore I may well enough call it a Demonstration, that the very same Persons, whoever they be, who are meant in the Commission by *all Nations*, and commanded to be baptiz'd, are all equally commanded to be taught likewise. And so far are the Words from intimating any thing to the contrary, and from distinguishing between some who are to be taught, and others who are not, that they are rather so order'd, as to render it scarce possible for any Man even but to surmise, that those two words *teach* and *baptize* do not both of 'em relate exactly to all the same Persons, and to whatever is meant in the Commission by *all Nations*.

Let

Let us take it for granted now, that thoſe to whom the Commiſſion is given, are bound to teach *all Nations*, as well as to baptize *all Nations*; and this will be the conſequence of it, that Infants cannot be included in this Commiſſion. For, if it requires the Subjects ſpoken of ſhou'd be taught as well as baptiz'd, then they muſt be all capable of Teaching as well as of Baptiſm: for the Scriptures, doubtleſs, are not ſo unreaſonable as to command us to do that to any Subject, which it is not capable of receiving. This wou'd not conſiſt with the higheſt Juſtice, and Goodneſs, and Wiſdom, with which we believe all our LORD's Inſtitutions are giv'n.

How then can the Pædobaptiſts perſuade themſelves, to fancy, contrary to the expreſs Words of the Scripture, that ſome only are to be taught, whilſt others may be as well baptiz'd without any Inſtruction at all?

They tell us, the Word here tranſlated *teach*, has another very different, and more proper Senſe; but how weak this Pretence is, I ſhall diſcover by and by. In the mean time, this Objection tacitly allows, that both Words do relate preciſely to the ſame Subjects; which is no leſs than yielding up the Diſpute: and I deſire no greater Advantage; for I hope to prove in the Sequel, beyond all Contradiction, that the *Greek* Word does neceſſarily and properly ſignify to *teach* or *inſtruct*, and never means *to make Diſciples*, but in that manner. I'll take it for granted then here, and at preſent only reply againſt their teaching of ſome, and not others, that there is no ground for it in the Words, the Inſtitution being univerſal in both its parts, *teaching* and *baptizing*: and as there is no Exception nor difference of Perſons made, ſo we muſt allow

allow of none; ſuch a Fancy being as ſtrongly guarded againſt as can poſſibly be, by expreſſing the Subjects of Baptiſm but once; to make it neceſſary that both the Words ſhou'd relate only to the ſame Individuals exactly.

All this makes it plain, that Infants cannot be comprehended, but are rather deſignedly excluded: for if Infants might be baptiz'd, then ſome might be baptiz'd, who neither do, nor are oblig'd to believe in CHRIST, and whom we are not, nor cannot be bound to perſuade and teach: which is directly contrary to the expreſs Words of the Inſtitution; for that, as is above demonſtrated, commands to *teach* all whom it commands to *baptize*; and therefore either both are commanded to be done to Infants, or neither. This ſhort Concluſion neceſſarily ariſes from the Commiſſion, that if it does not ſpeak of and enjoin teaching Infants, it does not enjoin baptizing 'em: for if the Term *all Nations* comprehends Infants, then they muſt be taught too, which is abſurd; and if it can't comprehend Infants, then they muſt not be baptiz'd: one of theſe things is unavoidable. The Inference I draw is, that they are not to be baptiz'd; becauſe I ſuppoſe no Man will imagine the Scriptures require us to preach the Goſpel to Infants, unleſs he's arriv'd to the good St. *Anthony*'s exalted pitch of religious Frenzy, and can think we ſhou'd preach to Fiſhes, wild Beaſts, Trees, *&c.*

2. But in the ſecond place, I am to ſhew, that the Commiſſion requires, All who are therein commanded to be baptiz'd, ſhou'd be firſt taught and inſtructed in the Principles of the Chriſtian Religion. If this can be made out, the Pædobaptiſts are effectually cut off from all their Pretences and Evaſions of any kind; for then undoubtedly,

doubtedly, not Infants, but the Adult only, are to be baptiz'd.

I have often enough repeated it already, and 'tis ſo plain that I think no body can deny it, that what this Commiſſion ſays of any one Perſon, it ſays equally of all, becauſe it ſpeaks only in general, of all, without Difference or Exception. From whence it follows, that the ſame things are to be done to all, and that too in the ſame Order. Since then it leaves no room in the leaſt for any Diſtinctions, but ſpeaks indifferently and univerſally of all; what it enjoins on one, it equally enjoins on all; and there remains only one of theſe two Extremes to be choſen; either that teaching muſt always, or that it muſt never precede Baptiſm.

The Pædobaptiſts are equally averſe from both theſe: but they muſt neceſſarily chooſe one; and either allow, that they ought always to teach Perſons before they baptize 'em; or elſe, that they may always, in all Caſes, baptize before they teach 'em. I know, they had rather ſay, that ſome are to be taught firſt, and others are to be baptiz'd firſt. But that can't be admitted, becauſe the Scripture allows no ground for any ſuch Diſtinction, but ſpeaks in the ſame manner of all in general: and if it makes it neceſſary, that Teaching or Baptiſm ſhou'd be firſt adminiſter'd to ſome, it makes it as neceſſary it ſhou'd be ſo to all.

Which then of the two remaining Extremes is to be adher'd to, 'twill not be very difficult to determine. No body dares ſay, that none are to be taught before they are baptiz'd: this wou'd ſhock every rational Enquirer, 'tis ſo groſs and palpable an Error, as might be ſhewn from the Nature of the Thing, and the Order obſerv'd in the Commiſſion, *&c.* And CHRIST certainly intended

tended to be underſtood, that his Miniſters ſhou'd teach the *Jews* and *Heathens*, and all Adult Perſons, before they were baptiz'd; which can only be imply'd in the Order of the Words, where Teaching is firſt mention'd. And accordingly, St. *Hierom*, as he is cited and tranſlated by Mr. *Wall* himſelf, ſays on theſe very Words, *They firſt teach all the Nations; then when they are taught, they baptize 'em with Water: for it cannot be that the Body ſhou'd receive the Sacrament of Baptiſm, unleſs the Soul have before receiv'd the true Faith.* The ſame Senſe is put upon the Commiſſion by others of the more antient Fathers, as I ſhall have occaſion to ſhew hereafter. But our Author adds, * *St.* Hierom *here commenting on the Commiſſion given by our* SAVIOUR *to the Apoſtles, of carrying the Goſpel to the Nations that were* Heathens, *explains the Method they were to uſe,* viz. *Firſt to teach thoſe Nations the Chriſtian Religion, and then baptize 'em; which all Pædobaptiſts grant to be the Method that ought ever to be us'd.*

I need not inſiſt then any longer on this, our Antagoniſts readily allowing, that at leaſt the Adult, and all ſuch as are capable of being taught, cannot be regularly baptiz'd without it. And therefore too, in the Catechiſm of the Church of *England*, we are told, that of Perſons to be baptiz'd are requir'd, *Repentance, whereby they forſake Sin; and Faith, whereby they ſtedfaſtly believe the Promiſes of* GOD, *&c.* making theſe the neceſſary Conditions of regularly adminiſtring Baptiſm; that is, as they mean, to the Adult.

We ſee therefore, that the Pædobaptiſts themſelves will not pretend they muſt *never* teach any before they baptize 'em; but on the contrary, make it neceſſary, at leaſt in ſome Caſes, to teach

* Part II. pag. 4.

firſt:

firſt: But if it muſt be ſo in ſome Caſes, then, as I have before demonſtrated, it muſt be ſo in all.

Having reduc'd the matter to this Dilemma, and withal it being neceſſarily and freely allow'd me, that the laſt part cannot be true; it evidently follows, that we are oblig'd to baptize only ſuch as have been firſt taught, and do, according to the Tenour of the Scriptures, profeſs a true Faith and Repentance.

Tho the foregoing Reaſoning is not long, it may be uſeful perhaps to contract it here, and give the whole Force of it in a ſhorter Compaſs, that the Evidence and Certainty of its parts may be more eaſily diſcern'd.

Either all muſt be taught before Baptiſm, or none, or ſome only. But there's no ground to ſay ſome only, becauſe the Commiſſion makes no Diſtinction between what is to be done to ſome, and not to others. Neither can it be ſaid, that none are to be taught firſt, for this ſhuts out even the Adult, which is againſt the Opinion of our Antagoniſts. It can only remain then, as a neceſſary Concluſion, that all in general are to be taught before they can be admitted to Baptiſm. And, by another Conſequence as ſtrong as the former, Infants cannot be of that Number, and muſt not be baptiz'd before they are taught.

To evade the Force of all this, it has been anſwer'd, and I muſt needs ſay ridiculouſly enough, That Infants are to be taught likewiſe, *viz.* when they come to Age, and are capable of it; ſo that tho the Commiſſion does require all who are baptiz'd to be taught alſo, yet that does not exclude Infants.

But, in the firſt place, I have juſt now ſhewn, that all muſt be taught *before* they can be regularly baptiz'd; and this unavoidably excludes Infants.

2. Suppoſing the Commiſſion cou'd allow of this Comment, then it may run thus: *Go teach all Nations, even Infants too when they are grown up*, &c. *i. e.* when they ceaſe to be Infants. This Shift can be of no Service to 'em: for if the Term *all Nations* only means Adult Perſons, and Infants when grown up, the Queſtion will be at an end, and we are agreed. 'Tis a pretty odd Diſtinction indeed, but they ſhall have it, if they pleaſe, and we'll allow, that Infants when they are grown up (that is, to ſpeak in our own way, and as we think more properly, when they are come out of that ignorant State, and are no longer Infants, but Adult Perſons) may be baptiz'd. And if this will reconcile us, let both Partys, inſtead of diſturbing each other, unite henceforward in a common Oppoſition of thoſe Enemys to the Sacraments of our moſt holy Religion, who dare wholly caſhier and reject the Ordinance.

Some again, with as little Judgment and Conſideration, endeavouring to avoid the Force of what I ſay, do in reality give me all I plead for. They frankly confeſs this Commiſſion relates peculiarly to the Adult; and therefore think it's no wonder it is expreſs'd ſo as to be applicable to them only. This is inſinuated more than once by * Mr. *Wall* himſelf; which I admire at. Did not he ſee 'tis all the Antipædobaptiſts deſir'd? that inſtead of invalidating what they urge, it was granting 'em their Argument? For we preſently return, that if this Commiſſion relates to Adult Perſons, as they confeſs, then it authorizes to baptize only ſuch: From whence 'tis eaſy and natural to infer, that no other Baptiſm is to be allow'd of. If this Commiſſion does not enjoin Infant-Baptiſm, we challenge 'em to ſhew us any

* Part II. pag. 378, 379.

other

other that does; and 'tis with the higheſt Reaſon we aſſert, there is no Commiſſion or Authority for it in Scripture.

But theſe are Trifles. A more material Objection is ſtill behind; namely, That the Term in the Commiſſion being *all Nations*, Infants, as being a part of the Nations, muſt equally be included with the reſt; and are therefore to be accounted as proper Subjects of Baptiſm, as Perſons of a more advanc'd Age. At firſt ſight this ſeems to carry ſomething plauſible in it; but a little Thought will preſently diſcover how ſuperficial it is.

For, in the largeſt Extent of the Phraſe, as taken to ſignify every Individual of each Species, all Unbelievers, and profane Blaſphemers, both among the *Jews* and *Heathens*, are comprehended too: So likewiſe are all Atheiſts, and the vileſt Debauchees: Add to theſe, all ſuperſtitious, obſtinate Idolaters; together with mere Naturals, and raving Madmen, *&c.* for theſe are all Parts of the *Nations* as truly as Infants. But none of our Adverſarys will ſay, theſe might therefore all, or any of 'em, be baptiz'd.

Beſides, you may take notice, Sir, that our LORD does not ſay the whole Nation, or every Perſon of every Nation, or all of all Nations, which wou'd have made the Caſe very different from what it is; but only indefinitely, all Nations. Scarce a Youngſter, who has begun his Logick, but is acquainted with the Diſtinction between *genera ſingulorum*, and *ſingula generum*: and there is viſibly a wide Difference between *all Nations*, as the holy Penman expreſſes it, and *all of all Nations*, as our Antagoniſts wou'd fain underſtand it. And, in ſhort, the plain Meaning of our LORD can be only this, that as before they had preach'd only to the *Jews*, now they ſhou'd preach

preach the same Gospel to all other Nations, and baptize 'em; that is, such of 'em as were capable of Baptism, and wou'd receive it.

Thus, for Example, in a parallel Instance of the same nature, † St. *John* is said to have baptiz'd *all* Judea, *and all the Region round about* Jordan: And yet we find in the following Verses, that he rebuk'd the *Pharisees* and *Sadducees*, and gave 'em to know, that such as brought not forth *Fruits meet for Repentance*, cou'd not be admitted. Besides, (which reaches exactly the Case in hand) I observe, 'tis added, Ver. 6. that they confess'd their Sins: which makes it plain, that Infants, were not baptiz'd by him, for they cou'd make no such Confession; and yet of all he there baptiz'd in general, 'tis said, namely of *Jerusalem, and all* Judea, *&c.* that *they were baptiz'd of him in* Jordan, *confessing their Sins.* Which by the way is, I think, a pretty plain Demonstration, that St. *John*, our LORD's Forerunner, did not admit Infants to his Baptism.

Now from all this it is evident, both that *all Judea*, &c. in this Place, and *all Nations* in the Commission, can only mean such as were capable and willing to receive the Faith, and did resolve to endeavour *to walk worthy of the Vocation wherewith they were call'd.* 'Tis wholly upon the Comprehensiveness of this Phrase that our Adversarys ground all their Hopes to find Infant-Baptism instituted in this Commission. This our Author confesses, when he says, that it * *affords this Argument for Pædobaptism; Infants are part of the Nations, and so to be baptiz'd by this Commission.* But I have utterly taken away this Pretence, and prov'd, there is no real ground from the Commission to think Infants ought to be baptiz'd. And the best

† Mat. iii. 5, 6. * Part II. pag. 378.

Argument for it is ſo very precarious, that I can't but wonder at Mr. *Dorrington*'s prepoſterous Attempt, to make uſe of this Text to prove from it, that Infants as well as others ought to be baptiz'd.

But that Author affects Wonders, and his whole Book is one, in which he undertakes to prove Infant-Baptiſm from Scripture; which is as much as to ſay, the Scripture poſitively aſſerts what it does not ſpeak one Word of. Mr. *Wall* has acted more modeſtly, and very ingenuouſly owns, all that can be found in the Scriptures is too obſcure to build upon, and ſo wiſely declines the Combat with that Weapon. And if the Rector of *Wittreſham* had better conſider'd the matter, 'tis likely he wou'd have laid by his Deſign, rather than have expos'd himſelf ſo much by the Publication of this Book.

What is ſaid above, concludes at leaſt thus much, that there is nothing in the Commiſſion which can be tolerably urg'd to prove, that Infants are included in it. But this is not all: I have likewiſe been arguing, that the Commiſſion neceſſarily and directly excludes Infants; and this I am chiefly concern'd here to make good. What we urge to this purpoſe, is principally from the word *Teach:* for as Mr. *Wall* propounds our Argument, † *Infants are ſuch a part of the Nations as are not capable of being taught, and ſo not to be baptiz'd:* becauſe the Commiſſion does as much command to teach, as to baptize all Nations; and if there be any difference, rather more ſtrongly: For 'tis to be noted, that the Subject *all Nations* is immediately join'd with *teach*; ſo that there cannot poſſibly be any Evaſion. This muſt needs be a powerful Argument to all Men that duly con-

* Part II. pag. 378.

ſider

sider it; and it highly concerns all Pædobaptists to get clear of it as well as they can.

But the word *Teach*, which makes the Difficulty, after a great deal of hammering, they at length conclude, does not truly express the Sense of the Original; and therefore they fall foul on the Translation, and tell us, the true Sense, in which it ought to be render'd, is, *disciple* or *proselyte*, instead of *teach all Nations*. Now, say they, tho Infants are not capable of being taught, yet they may be proselyted. But I think this Criticism has nothing in it.

If, indeed, the *Greek* Word does signify barely to *disciple*, by baptizing suppose, or any other way, without including to *teach*, all our Argument from this Place unavoidably falls to the Ground. And that it does signify so, is very frequently asserted by the Divines of the Church of *England*; among the rest, by ‖ Dr. *Hammond*; from whom our Author takes it, as he has done most of his best Thoughts.

I name Dr. *Hammond* in particular, because there is something in his Conduct upon this Point, which deserves especial Notice: For tho he is certainly a considerable Man, yet his Opinion will weigh but very little on one side or the other in this Case, because he grosly contradicts himself, and by turns equally countenances and rejects both. When he is bent upon destroying all that may be thought to prejudice the Cause of Infant-Baptism, then he says, † the Word does not signify to *teach*, but to receive into Discipleship, by Baptism as the Ceremony, without supposing any preceding Instruction: And yet, notwithstanding he is so positive here, in his Paraphrase and Annotation he strenuously asserts the direct contrary, and thus

‖ *Six Querys*, pag. 196. † Ib.

paraphraſes the Words, *teach all Nations the Chriſtian Doctrine, and perſuade 'em to embrace it, and to live according to it.* And in the Note, he has more to the ſame purpoſe. In his Diſſertations on Epiſcopacy, he runs the Words thus: * *Call to Diſcipleſhip, or inſtruct all Nations in the Faith and Diſcipline, certify all of the Reſurrection of* CHRIST; *and by preaching the Goſpel in all Parts, gather Diſciples, and thoſe you have ſo gather'd, baptize and teach.*

So plainly does this learned Man contradict himſelf: upon which, this Remark is obvious, That when the Doctor's Mind was not immediately under the Power of Prejudices, (which were as ſtrong in him ſometimes as in other Men) and when he had no Intereſt to ſerve; he cou'd ſee and acknowledg the Truth, which the Duſt his Prejudices rais'd hinder'd him from ſeeing at other times.

But farther, this Anſwer is utterly falſe; and is accordingly diſown'd by Men of the greateſt Learning; as † *Cameron*, || *Grotius*, †† *Rigaltius*, with others, whom I ſhall mention hereafter. Add to theſe the Right Reverend and Learned Biſhop of *Sarum*, who in his judicious Expoſition of the Articles, ſays thus: ||| *By the firſt* Teaching *or making* Diſciples, *that muſt go before Baptiſm, is to be meant the convincing the World, that* JESUS *is the* CHRIST, *the true* MESSIAS, *anointed of* GOD *with Fulneſs of Grace, and of the* SPIRIT

---

* *Diſſert.* 3. cap. 4. §. 1. *Ad Diſcipulatum vocate*, vel Diſciplina & Fide imbuite Gentes omnes, Reſurrectionem CHRISTI omnibus teſtatam facite, & *Evangelio* per omnes *oras* enunciato, Diſcipulos congregate, congregatos βαπτίζοντες & διδάσκοντες.

† In loc. || In loc. †† In *Cyprian.* Epiſt. 64.

||| *Page* 300.

without Measure; and sent to be the SAVIOUR *and* REDEEMER *of the World. And when any were brought to acknowledg this, then they were to baptize them, to initiate them to this Religion,* &c. *and then they led 'em into the Water; and with no other Garments, but what might cover Nature, they at first laid them down in the Water, as a Man is laid in a Grave; and then they said these Words,* I baptize or wash thee in the Name of the FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST: *Then they rais'd them up again, and clean Garments were put on them,* &c. In this Account of the Method the Apostles and first Christians pursu'd, his Lordship has given almost as exact a Description of our Practice to this day, as if he had design'd to express it.

Dr. *Whitby* likewise, somewhat more largely, with his usual Modesty and Candour, corrects this Mistake. * Μαθητεύειν, says he, *here is* to preach the Gospel to all Nations, *and to engage them to believe it, in order to their Profession of that Faith by Baptism.* This he goes on to confirm, and then adds, *I desire any one to tell me, how the* Apostles *cou'd,* μαθητεύειν, make Disciples *of an* Heathen, *or unbelieving* Jew, *without being* μαθηταὶ, or Teachers *of them; whether they were not sent to preach to those that cou'd hear, and to teach them to whom they preach'd, that* JESUS was the CHRIST, *and only to* baptize *them when they did believe this? This is so absolutely necessary, in the Nature of the Thing, till a* Christian Church *among the* Heathens *or the* Jews *was founded, and so expressly said by* † Justin Martyr *to have been the Practice of the first*

* In loc.

† Apol. 2. p. 93. E. Ὅσοι ἂν πεισθῶσι καὶ πιστεύωσιν ἀληθῆ ταῦτα τὰ ὑφ' ἡμῶν διδασκόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα εἶναι, καὶ βιῶν ὅπως δύνασθαι ὑποχωροῦσι, εὔχεσθαί τε καὶ αἰτεῖν, &c. ἔπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστὶ, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀναγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννῶνται.

Ages of the Church; *that to deny what is confirm'd by such Evidence of Reason and* Church History, *wou'd be to prejudice a Cause, which in my poor Judgment, needs not this Interpretation of the Word* μαθητεύειν; *nor needs it be asserted, that Infants are made* Disciples, *any more than that they are made* Believers *by Baptism*, &c.

I don't see how it is possible to make any Reply to this, and therefore I might be excus'd from adding any thing more; but because the Stress of our Argument from the Commission lies chiefly in this Word, and our Adversarys generally make it their main Ressource, I will the more studiously proceed to shew, beyond question, 1. From the Sense of the *Greek* Word; 2. From the Authority of the several Versions; 3. From the Opinions of the Fathers; and lastly, From the Scriptures themselves, and the Practice of the Apostles; that μαθητεύσατε does always, and particularly in the Place under consideration, signify to *teach* or *instruct*, and to make Disciples only by so doing.

1. I begin first with shewing, that μαθητεύειν is constantly us'd to signify nothing less than to *teach* and *instruct*. This seems to me so incontestably evident on all accounts, that I am really not a little amaz'd to find it contradicted by Men so considerable for Learning and good Sense.

If we do but try all the Methods which are us'd in finding out the true Sense of a Word, we can never fail of perceiving how certainly this is the Sense of the Word before us. And if any one can make the Experiment, and after Examination deny it signifys to *teach*, he may as well, if he pleases, open his Eyes, and turning to the Sun when it shines out, deny there's any Sun at all, or affirm 'tis Midnight.

As

As to the Origination of the Word, if any thing may be infer'd from thence; (and ſurely it muſt rather bear ſome Agreement in Signification with its Primitive, than contradict it; it having always been thought one good way to know the Senſe of a Word, to enquire into its Etymology) Its Origination, I ſay, leaves not the leaſt room for our Antagoniſts to ſurmize as they do, but concludes againſt 'em as ſtrongly as any thing of this nature can do, and makes it neceſſary to underſtand it to ſignify to *teach*, *inſtruct*, or the like.

No Man doubts but μανθάνειν, the Theme, ſignifys properly *diſcere*, *docere*, to *learn*, to *teach* or *inſtruct*; and it may be obſerv'd, that all Words deriv'd from it, do ever retain ſome Marks of this Signification: thus Μάθημα, a *Document*, *Inſtruction*, or *that which is taught or learn'd*: Μαθητὸς, *teachable*, or apt to learn: Μαθητιάω, *I deſire to learn.* And ſo in its Compounds, Ἄμαθής, *unlearn'd*; Ἀρτιμαθὴς, *one that lately began to learn*; Αὐτομαθὴς, *one that learn'd of himſelf*, without the help of a Maſter: Ὀλιγομαθὴς, *one that learn'd but little*: And πολυμαθὴς, *one that has learn'd much.* Ἀναμανθάνω, *I learn again.* Καταμανθάνω, *I learn thorowly, or exactly.* Συμμανθάνειν, *to learn together*; from whence συμμαθητὴς, a *School-fellow*, or Fellow-learner. And ſo in like manner of all the reſt.

Since then the Primitive ſignifys to learn, *&c.* and all its Derivatives and Compounds retain the like Senſe, why muſt only μαθητὴς and μαθητέυω be excepted? And where's their Ingenuity, who ſo irregularly, and contrary to the Analogy of the *Greek* Tongue, arbitrarily pretend that theſe Words have no relation to teaching, *&c.* only becauſe this Fancy ſerves their Purpoſe ſomething better? whereas an impartial

Judg wou'd from this Obſervation alone, conclude μαθητεύειν muſt needs ſignify *to teach*, or *to be taught*, or *to cauſe to be taught*, or ſome ſuch thing, which ſhou'd include teaching.

I ſuppoſe no body will any more recur to the antiquated Invention which ſome Grammarians have long been proud of, I mean the *Antiphraſis*, which is now exploded by the beſt and moſt learned Philologiſts, as a mere Cover for the Ignorance of thoſe who uſe it. I need not refer you to the *Spaniſh Minerva*; for to be ſure you remember well enough the 16th Chapter of the 4th Book, where *Sanctius* ſolidly expoſes the Miſtake thoſe Grammarians committed, who when they knew no better, imagin'd Words were ſometimes us'd in a contrary Senſe to the Primitive from whence they were deriv'd. *Lucus* in *Latin* is a common Inſtance in every body's mouth; but the more accurate and judicious now no longer ſay 'tis deriv'd *a lucendo, quia minimè luceat*; but rather, becauſe of the great and almoſt continual Illuminations in the Groves, occaſion'd by Sacrifices, *&c.* as ſay * *Voſſius*, and † *Perizonius*, to name no more. And if this *Antiphraſis* be, as *Voſſius* expreſſes it, but a ‖ *ſilly Whim of the Grammarians*, who are oftentimes none of the ableſt Criticks, then Μαθητὴς, and μαθητεύω, as they are deriv'd from μανθάνειν, to *learn*, &c. muſt likewiſe bear ſome Congruity in their Signification, and not be applicable to ſuch as are not capable of learning or being taught.

But ſome argue from the Termination, and pretend, that Verbs in εύω are to be interpreted by *ſum* in *Latin*; and ſo μαθητὴς ſignifying a Diſ-

---

* Partit Orator. *p.* 339.

† In Sanct. Minerva, *p.* 931.

‖ Etymolog. ad vocem *Lucus*. Inane Grammaticorum Commentum, *&c.*

ciple

ciple only, μαθητεύω might be render'd *sum Discipulus*. It is easy to see how trifling this is; and that were it true, it cou'd be of no use to our Adversarys; for Μαθητὴς we assert means such a Disciple only as is taught; and then μαθητεύειν will signify, according to their own way, to be such Disciples. But besides, the Criticism is utterly false, as might be made appear from innumerable Examples: thus κελεύω signifys *jubeo*, to *command*, as well as κελω, from whence it is form'd; and so βουλεύω to *counsel*, &c. from βόλω. The like may be observ'd of ῥεύω, from whence ῥέω forms some of its Tenses, so perfectly synonymous are the two Words; as are also σέω, σῶ, and σεύω; χέω and χεύω; πλέω, πλεύω; πνέω, πνεύω: and this may be seen too in βασιλεύω, ἀγορεύω, ἡγεμονεύω, φονεύω, θραπεύω, ἀληθεύω, στρατεύω, χορεύω, θρησκεύω, ἐποπτεύ, προφητεύω, μαντεύω, and παιδεύω an Instance in the very Case, beside Multitudes which I pass by, none of which can admit of the Sense pretended.

Upon all this, I think I may safely conclude, according to the Analogy of Derivations in the *Greek* Tongue, as well as in all other Languages, that as *Disciple* in *English* is made of the Latin *Discipulus*, which comes from *discere* to *learn*; and as διδάσκαλος *a Tutor, Teacher, Master*, from διδάσκειν to *teach*, because such a Master διδάσκει does *teach*; but κύριος a *Master* or Governor, from κῦρος, full *Power* and *Authority*, because Masters and Governors are suppos'd, κῦρος ἔχειν, *to have* such *Power*: so Μαθητὴς ἀπὸ τοῦ μάθον comes from μανθάνειν to *learn* or *teach*, because μαθηταὶ, or Disciples learn or are taught: and hence μαθητεύω is the proper Word to signify the Action of Teaching, whereby Persons are to be made such Disciples,

Diſciples, or if you pleaſe *of diſcipling* or making *Diſciples* by teaching. But let this ſuffice concerning the Origination of the Word, and the Aſſiſtance it yields to find out the true Senſe of it.

What I am going to add in the next place, will perhaps be thought leſs liable to Exception, than arguing upon Etymologys, which with ſome Men is but trifling: I will therefore prove what I have affirm'd, by the Uſe of the Word in *Greek* Authors, which muſt be allow'd to carry Weight in it.

Of all the Paſſages wherein I have obſerv'd it to occur, I don't know, nor believe there is one, but does neceſſarily include and ſignify teaching, or at leaſt may admit it: and nothing any where gives reaſonable ground ſo much as to ſurmize the contrary; ſo far is it from being as our Adverſarys pretend: and if they ſhou'd be able to produce one Inſtance where, by ſome ſtrange Chance, or a violent *Catachreſis*, it does ſignify to *diſciple*, and exclude teaching, which I am perſuaded they will never be able to do, that will be far ſhort of a ſufficient Reaſon to ſay the Word ſignifys ſo elſewhere; much leſs that 'tis the proper Signification in which it is always or commonly us'd: and yet our Adverſarys, ſome of 'em at leaſt, are very fond of the Thought, and wou'd fain perſuade *us* to believe it too.

But the Evidence on our ſide, that the *Greek* Word includes teaching, *&c.* is plain from theſe following Inſtances.

Plutarch in the Account he gives of the Life of *Iſocrates*, ſays, that when he taught Rhetorick at *Athens*, *Hyperides*, *Iſæus*, and *Demoſthenes* came to him, and made him this Offer, That ſince they cou'd not give him a thouſand *Drachms*, his uſual Fee,

Fee, they wou'd not expect to be taught the whole Art, but wou'd pay him two hundred Drachms for a fifth part of it only. By the way obſerve, their ſole Aim was to learn or be taught. To their Propoſal *Iſocrates* returns this Anſwer: ‖ *We don't uſe*, Demoſthenes, *to divide our Art; but as good Fiſh are ſold entire, ſo if you have a mind to learn*, or to be taught (μαθητεύειν) *I will inſtruct you in the whole Art.* This Inſtance can need no Improvement: for you have nothing to do but to read the Paſſage, in order to ſee that all they apply to *Iſocrates* for, was his Inſtruction; and that therefore in his Anſwer he ſpeaks of nothing elſe.

And that this is the Senſe of the Word in the Language of the primitive Church, methinks ſhou'd be exceeding plain to all who are not utter Strangers to thoſe uſeful Pieces of Antiquity which ſtill remain; for they furniſh us with Inſtances in abundance, and very clear to the purpoſe. Thus the holy Martyr St. *Ignatius*, giving ſome Inſtructions to the *Epheſians*, with his uſual profound Humility and Meekneſs, adds, † *Not that I take upon me to direct you, as if I were any body: For tho I am bound for His Name, I am not yet perfect in* CHRIST JESUS; *nay, I am as it were but now beginning* (μαθητεύεσθαι) *to learn*, or *to be inſtructed*; *and I ſpeak to you as Fellow-Diſciples with me*, &c. If there cou'd have been otherwiſe

---

‖ Vit. decem Rhetor. p. 1539. Τὸν δὲ ἀποκείνασθαι ὡς ἐ τεμαχίζομεν, ὦ Δημόσθενες, τὴν πραγματείαν· ὥσπερ δὲ τὸς καλὸς ἰχθῦς ὅλους πωλοῦμεν, ὅπω κἀγώ σοι, εἰ βέλοιο μαθητεύειν, ὁλόκληρον ἀποδώσομαι τὴν τέχνην.

† Epiſt. ad Epheſ. cap. 3. Οὐ διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν, ὡς ὤν τις· εἰ γὰρ καὶ δέδεμαι ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, ὅπω ἀπήρτισμαι ἐν ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΩ· νῦν γὰρ ἀρχὴν ἔχω τοῦ μαθητεύεσθαι, καὶ προσκαλῶ ὑμῖν ὡς συνδιδασκαλίτας μου, &c.

any

any doubt what the Word might ſignify here, συνδιδασκαλίταις immediately following in the laſt Sentence, wou'd have made it certain; for to ſay he ſpeaks to them as Fellow-Learners, becauſe he did but then begin μαθητεύεσθαι, muſt render it yet more neceſſary to underſtand the Word there, to mean to *learn*, or *be taught* or *inſtructed*, &c.

Beſides, he uſes the ſame Word again exactly thus a little after, where he directs the *Epheſian* Chriſtians how to behave themſelves even towards Unbelievers and Strangers to the Faith; and adviſes 'em to pray for all Men: * *For*, ſays he, *there is ſome hope they may repent, and obtain the Mercy of* GOD: *let 'em be inſtructed* (μαθητευθῆναι) *by your good Works. When they are angry, be you kind and forgiving*, &c. And again, in that admirable Epiſtle to the *Romans*, ſo worthy of a Chriſtian Biſhop, wherein he expreſſes an ardent and impatient Deſire to ſuffer Martyrdom for CHRIST; among other things, he moſt earneſtly entreats 'em not to deprive him, thro their miſtim'd Kindneſſes, of that glorious Crown, by uſing their Intereſt to prevent the Death he was then going to ſuffer by wild Beaſts in the Amphitheatre at *Rome*. More, ſays the illuſtrious Saint, you cannot do for me, than to ſuffer me to be ſacrific'd to GOD. And a little after: † *Ye have never envy'd me in any thing; ye have taught others; I wou'd therefore that thoſe things alſo ſhou'd be confirm'd by your Prac-*

---

* Epiſt. ad Epheſ. cap. 10. Καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν λοιπῶν δὲ ἀνθρώπων ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε· ἔστι γὰρ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐλπὶς μετανοίας, ἵνα ΘΕΟΥ τύχωσιν· ἐπιτρέψατε οὖν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ὑμῶν μαθητευθῆναι· πρὸς τὰς ὀργὰς αὐτῶν ὑμεῖς πραεῖς, &c.

† Epiſt. ad Romanos, cap. 3. Οὐδέποτε ἐβασκάνατε ἐμοί· ἄλλους ἐδιδάξατε· ἐγὼ δὲ θέλω, ἵνα κἀκεῖνα βέβαια ᾖ, ἃ μαθητεύοντες ἐντέλλεσθε μόνον δύναμιν αἰτεῖσθέ μοι ἔσωθέν τε καὶ ἔξωθεν, ἵνα μὴ μόνον λέγω, ἀλλὰ καὶ θέλω, &c.

tice,

tice, which you have preſcrib'd in teaching (μαθητεύοντες) *only pray for me that I may be ſo ſtrengthen'd within and without, as not only to be call'd a Chriſtian, but alſo to be found one.*

Theſe Inſtances, without adding any more, might very well ſuffice to ſhew that μαθητεύειν ſignifys to *teach*, &c. But to convince you that this is not only a caſual, but the conſtant Senſe of the Word, I muſt take the liberty to add ſeveral Inſtances more.

Clemens Alexandrinus diſcourſing of the Uſe of Philoſophy in Theological Studys, againſt ſuch as wou'd have the *Greek* Learning altogether uſeleſs; after he has ſaid a great deal to that purpoſe, he obſerves that even the Philoſophy, they were ſuch Enemys, to borrow'd many things from the Scriptures; and adds, that * *the things ſo borrow'd in part are true; and are grounded ſometimes upon bare Conjectures, and ſometimes on neceſſary Reaſons. If they do learn* (μαθητευθέντες) that is, borrow *ſomething from the* Hebrew *Philoſophy, let them acknowledg it.*

Again, ſhewing how Philoſophy tends to bring Men to the Knowledg of the true Religion, by engaging all impartial Enquirers † *to converſe not only with the* Greeks, *but with the* Barbarians *too* (as the *Jews* and Chriſtians were then call'd)

---

* Stromat. Lib. 1. pag. 320. Ἐκ μέρους πίνυν ἃ κεκλόφασιν, ἀληθῆ μέ· σοφιστικῶς δὲ καὶ παῖς τὸ λόγων ἀνάγκαις ἴσασι. μαθητευθέντες οὖν καθαληπτικῶς ὁπτηνώτουσαι.

† Stromat. Lib. 6. pag. 691. Ἔπειτα οὐ πρὸς Ἕλληνας μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ βαρβάροις ὁμιλήσαντες, ὅπῃ τῷ πίστιν ἐκ συναγωγῆς κοινῆς εἰς σύνεσιν ἰδίαν ἄγονται παραδεξάμενοι δὲ τὸ θεμέλιον τὸ ἀληθείας δύναμιν προσλαμβάνουσι προϊέναι ὅπῃ τὴν ζήτησιν· καὶ ἐνθένδε ἀγαπῶσι μὲ μαθητευσάμενοι, γνώσεως δὲ ἐπιγνώμενοι σπεύδουσιν εἰς σωτηρίαν.

and

and by these common ways of improving their Knowledg they are brought to the Faith; and then having laid the Foundation of the Truth, they are better enabled to go on in the Search after it. And hence it is that being taught (μαθητευσάμενοι) or instructed in the Faith, they approve of it; and by pursuing after Knowledg, they vigorously pursue Salvation. 'Tis plainly impossible in these Instances to put any other sense on the Word in dispute than what I contend for.

Another Passage of this Author I can't omit, it being if possible more plain and cogent than the former; * *Those Men, says he, that are transform'd into Angels, are first instructed (μαθητεύονται) by 'em a thousand Years, and so rais'd to Perfection: and then the Teachers were translated to Arch-Angels; and the Learners in their stead instructed (μαθητεύσαν) or taught those who were to be chang'd from Men to Angels.* Here μαθητεύειν is most apparently interpreted by St. *Clement* himself to mean διδάσκειν as it relates to the Angels, and μανθάνειν as it relates to the Persons that were taught; which renders the Instance perfectly unexceptionable.

To the same Effect *Justin Martyr* too uses this word in his Apology to the *Roman* Senate: † *If we were to kill one another, we shou'd be the Causes as far as in us lay, that no more Persons shou'd be brought into the World, and taught (μαθητευθῆναι) or instructed in the Christian Religion, and*

---

* Clem. Alexandr. Ecclog. pag. 809. a. Οἱ γὰρ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων εἰς Ἀγγέλους μεταχθέντες χίλια ἔτη μαθητεύονται ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀγγέλων, εἰς τελειότητα ἀποκαθισάμενοι. εἶτα, οἱ μὲν διδάξαντες μεταπέμπονται εἰς ἀρχαγγελικὴν ἐξουσίαν· οἱ μαθόντες δὲ, τοὺς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων αὖθις μεθισαμένους εἰς ἀγγέλους μαθητεύουσιν.

† Apolog. 1. aut melius 2. pag. 43. Εἰ ἓν πάντες ἐαυτοὺς φονεύσομεν, ἵνα μὴ (lege μὴν) γνωθῶμεν πρὸ, καὶ μαθητευθῶμεν εἰς τὰ θεῖα διδάγματα, ἢ καὶ μὴ εἶναι τὸ ἀνθρώπειον γένος, ὅσον ἐφ' ἡμῖν, αἴτιοι ἐσόμεθα.

of

of putting an end to Human Kind. And again, in his Dialogue with *Trypho* the *Jew*, he tells him, that as GOD, for the ſake of thoſe Seventy Thouſand who had not bow'd the Knee to *Baal*, forbore to pour out his Anger upon the whole Body; * *So now in like manner*, ſays St. *Juſtin*, *GOD has not, or does not pour down his Judgments, as knowing that ſome every day are taught to believe* (μαθητευομένους) *in the Name of his* CHRIST, *and do forſake their erroneous Ways.*

'Tis a Difficulty to tranſlate the Word here by any one in *Engliſh*, which will ſufficiently expreſs the Senſe of the Original. This Paſſage may be thought therefore to make rather againſt me than for me, eſpecially if it ſhou'd be aſſerted, that the Phraſe μαθητεύειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ here, is the ſame in Senſe with βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ. For to this purpoſe our Antagoniſts talk, when they pretend μαθητεύειν in the Commiſſion is explain'd by the following Words, and means, by *baptizing* them, *&c.* But I know, Sir, you are not liable to be impos'd on by ſuch Fancys: for to proſelyte to CHRIST, or to diſciple to CHRIST, tho it be not the Meaning of the Word, may indeed be good Senſe enough; but to proſelyte into the Name of CHRIST, is a Phraſe I believe never us'd: Beſides, no Man will ever be able to find an Inſtance, where μαθητεύειν is put for, and ſignifys βαπτίζειν.

But if the Word be here us'd in the Senſe our Antagoniſts aſſert, it ſhou'd be render'd *diſcipled in the Name of* CHRIST: and this, tho a very odd obſcure ſort of Phraſe, may be admit-

---

* Pag. 258. Τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον, καὶ νῦν ὐδέπω τὴν κρίσιν ἐπήνεγκεν ἢ ἐπάγει γινώσκων ὅτι καθ' ἡμέραν τινὰς μαθητευομένους εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ Αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπολείποντας τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς πλάνης.

ted,

ted, if it be underſtood to include teaching, and means to diſciple only by that; which will not be allow'd: and yet to diſciple in the Name of CHRIST, without teaching, is Nonſenſe, and can have no Meaning at all; for εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, *in the Name*, intends *into the Belief*, as Dr. *Whitby* paraphraſes *Matth.* xxviii. 19. and the moſt learned Interpreters generally agree. And to be baptiz'd in the Name of CHRIST, is explain'd *Rom.* vi. 3. by being *baptiz'd into* CHRIST, and *into his Death*; and *Gal.* iii. 27. by *putting on* CHRIST: all which muſt needs imply a Profeſſion of Faith in CHRIST, and his Death, into which they were baptiz'd, as all the Antients underſtood it. Upon which account, Baptiſm was call'd in the *Greek* Church σφραγὶς τῆς πίστεως; and in the *Latin* Church, *Sigillum Fidei*, the Seal of Faith.

The Subſtance of all this Mr. *Wall* himſelf likewiſe allows, when he inſinuates, that ſome among us who baptize only in the Name of the LORD JESUS, are probably *Socinians*; and † *it is not for the uſe of thoſe*, ſays he, *that have a mind to obliterate the Faith of the* TRINITY, *to baptize their Proſelytes into the Faith and Name of it.* From which Words it ſeems plain enough, that Mr. *Wall* by εἰς τὸ ὄνομα underſtands *into the Faith*: Now, to initiate or diſciple into, or to the Faith of CHRIST, ſuch as at the ſame time either don't or can't know any thing of CHRIST, is an Abſurdity of the firſt Rank.

It follows then, that the true Senſe of the Word is no other than what I have given it: and if you will ſtill have it render'd *diſcipled* to the Name of CHRIST, that can however only mean in better *Engliſh*, inſtructed in, and brought over to

† Part II. *p.* 222.

the

the Faith of CHRIST, which is the Sense I contend for. Besides, it may be farther observ'd, that St. *Justin* is here speaking particularly of Adult Persons, who of *Jews* became *Christians*; which must be by believing in CHRIST, and *forsaking their Errors*, as he expresses it. And of the same Persons again, a little after, he says; *They receiv'd the Gifts of the* SPIRIT *as every one was worthy, being enlightned by the Name of* CHRIST.

If φωτιζόμενος is here pretended to mean baptiz'd, as Mr. *Wall* says it sometimes signify'd in the more distant Centurys of the Church, but I think not so early as St. *Justin*'s time; it will be thereby yet plainer, that μαθητεύειν a little before cou'd not intend the same, but something else, *viz.* to instruct, upon which this Baptism follow'd; the Passage wou'd otherwise be a gross Tautology.

But if that Word only denotes the enlightning of the Mind, which seems most likely, it will still argue, that μαθητεύειν which precedes it, must signify to instruct, because the Mind cannot be enlightned but by Instruction. And if we only observe, that the Persons spoken of are, as I said, Adult, such as, 'tis granted on all hands, cannot become Christians without Faith in CHRIST, which must come by Hearing; this Consideration alone is enough to determine, that the Sense of the Word in this place is as I have render'd it, because 'tis apply'd to such as undoubtedly were actually instructed, and prevail'd on to believe, and cou'd not be initiated, discipled, or what you'll please to call it, without such Instruction. This I suppose is now sufficiently plain, and therefore I proceed to another Instance from the same Father.

A few Lines after, he tells his Antagoniſt, that the *Jews* honour GOD and his CHRIST with their Lips only; * *but we*, ſays he, *having been inſtructed* (μεμαθητευμένοι) *or taught in all Truth, honour 'em in our Actions, and Knowledg, and in our whole Minds, even unto Death.* Μεμαθητευμένοι is ſo ſtrictly connected to Ἀληθείας in this Paſſage, that tranſlate it into *Engliſh* by what Word you pleaſe, it muſt of neceſſity imply *learning*, *teaching*, or the like; for no one can be diſcipled, &c. *to* or *by the Truth* any other way.

But I need not repeat Inſtances of this kind; for the more learned and judicious will allow, that when the Word is us'd *tranſitively*, as the Grammarians ſpeak, it does always ſignify as I contend: but when 'tis us'd in a *neuter* or *intranſitive* Senſe, as 'tis often believ'd to be, they think it does not ſignify to *teach*, &c. I don't indeed remember that Mr. *Wall* any where makes this Diſtinction; tho I know ſome of the Pædobaptiſts do: but he chuſes to aſſert, with a dogmatical Air, as if it was one of the plaineſt things in the World, that the Word † *ſignifys much like what we ſay in* Engliſh *to* enter any one's Name, *as a Scholar*, *Diſciple*, *or Proſelyte*, &c. and this he never goes about to prove, or give the leaſt Reaſon for, but only ſhews how that Interpretation of the Word makes for his purpoſe; as if that was Reaſon enough, and all Men were oblig'd to ſubmit to his Determination.

But it will appear that he is altogether miſtaken in this Criticiſm, by ſhewing, that even this artful Diſtinction of ſome Men which was

* Dialog. cum Tryphon. pag. 258. Ἡμεῖς δὲ, καὶ ἐν ἔργοις, καὶ γνώσει, καὶ καρδίᾳ, μέχει θανάτου οἱ ἐκ πάσης τῆς Ἀληθείας μεμαθητευμένοι, τιμῶμεν.

† Part II. pag. 378.

just now mention'd, can be of no use, because the Word even in this Neuter Signification, does always mean and include teaching.

At present, I remember but one Passage which is cited on this occasion, by those of the contrary Opinion, and that is *Matth.* xxvii. 57. where 'tis said of *Joseph* of *Arimathea*, ἐμαθητεύσε, or as *Beza*'s Copy at *Cambridge* reads it, ἐμαθητεύθη τῷ ΙΗΣΟΥ, which our Translation renders, *was* JESUS *Disciple.* This is suppos'd to be a plain Instance that the Word signifys simply *to be a Disciple*; and therefore || *Constantine* cites only this place, to confirm the Neuter Signification he puts upon the Word, in opposition to *teach*; the transitive Sense he had before mention'd.

To this I answer: 'Tis plainly a Mistake to suppose the Word is ever us'd as a *Neuter*, or *Intransitively.* Its being frequently construe'd with a Dative Case, perhaps might occasion the Mistake; for I observe *Stephens* *, *Busby* †, &c. note, that when it's join'd with a Dative, it signifys *to be a Disciple:* but of all the Instances of this Construction I don't know one which will sufficiently confirm this Supposition.

As for that produc'd by *Constantine*, from *Matt.* xxvii. 57. 'tis very short of the Point; for why may not it as well be render'd, *had been instructed, taught*, &c. *by* CHRIST? or, *was brought over to* JESUS, as well as, *was* JESUS *Disciple?* For this will express the Sense of the Place, as well at least as the vulgar Translation; and with this Advantage too, that the Words I use are much more agreeable to the Origination and Primary Sense of the *Greek* Word, which ought to be consider'd. Besides, 'tis plain, that *Joseph*, who was

|| In Lexic. ad Voc.
* Thesaur. Græc. ad Voc. † Gram. Græc. p. 162.

a *Jew*, cou'd not become a Diſciple of CHRIST, but by being taught, and convinc'd that he was the true MESSIAH who was to come: and the very Import and Deſign of the Words is manifeſtly to ſignify, that *Joſeph* did believe in JESUS; and therefore I can't ſee any reaſon to ſuppoſe the Word has a new Senſe here, when that which 'tis ſo generally us'd in, is ſo proper.

To make it yet clearer what the Word means in this Conſtruction, I will preſent you with ſeveral other Inſtances, which I believe will oblige you to underſtand it in my Senſe.

Plutarch, in the Life of *Antiphon* the Orator, ſays, * *he was taught* (μαθητεύσας) *by his Father, who profeſs'd Oratory*, &c. 'Tis obſervable, that *Plutarch* has himſelf explain'd the force of the Word here, by theſe Words which immediately follow: *and having learn'd the Art of Pleading, he gave himſelf to the Publick.* And in the Life of *Iſocrates*, he tells us, † *Theopompus of* Scio, Ephorus *of* Cuma, Aſclepiades *the Writer of Tragedys, and* Theodectes *of* Phaſelis, *were all educated* (ἐμαθήτευσε) *or taught, or inſtructed by, or brought up under him.*

Again, he ſays of *Æſchines*, that ‖ *according to ſome, he had never been taught* (μαθητεῦσαι) *by any Maſter, but by Writing in the Courts, became acquainted with the Forms and Manner of Proceeding.*

---

* Vit. decem Rhetor. *pag.* 1530. Μαθηθεὶς δὲ τὸν Πατέρα (ἦν γὰρ σοφιςὴς, &c.) καὶ δύναμιν λόγων κτησάμενος, &c. ὥρμησε καὶ πολιτεύεσθαι.

† Ibid. *pag.* 1539. Ἐμαθήτευσε δ' αὐτῷ καὶ Θεόπομπος ὁ Χῖος, καὶ Ἔφορος ὁ Κυμαῖος, καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδης ὁ τὰ τραγῳδούμενα συγγράψας, καὶ Θεοδέκτης ὁ Φασηλίτης, &c.

‖ Ib. *pag.* 1545. Οἱ δὲ εἶπον μηδὲ μαθητεῦσαι τινὶ τὸν Αἰσχίνην, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς ἀντεξαμιλλείας ἀφθῆναι, ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις τὴν διάνοιαν.

In

In these and all other such-like Passages, the Word is manifestly us'd to signify to *be educated* or *instructed by* such and such Masters: or as *Plutarch* expresses the same thing in another place, speaking of * *Æschines, he learn'd to read of his Father.* So that if σὺν is omitted in the other places, by an Ellipsis (as 'tis very usual) the full Construction will be just the same with this. Or if this Preposition shou'd not be inserted, *Origen*, who was not only a great Philosopher and Divine, but a great Master of Language too, plainly shews us, that these Forms are certainly Elliptical, and that the Dative Case is not govern'd by the Verb but a Preposition, sometimes expres's'd, but commonly indeed to be understood.

The Passage from whence I gather this, is a good Instance against *Stephens*, *Constantine*, &c. that the *Greek* Word in dispute, even in this Construction, has no other Sense than that which I give it. *Origen*'s Words are these, in answer to a Question put by himself, namely, when the *Jews*, who believ'd in CHRIST, learn'd of the FATHER? because the LORD had said, *John* vi. 45. *Every Man therefore that hath heard, and hath learn'd of the* FATHER, *cometh unto me: Origen* answers as a third Person, but yet agreeably enough to what was known to be his own Opinion, † *The Words must not be understood as tho any one had seen the* FATHER, *for only He who is with the* FATHER *has seen Him; but to import, that the Souls of some, before they came into the Body and were born into the World* (μεμαθητευμένοι παρὰ τῷ Πατρὶ) *were taught by the* FATHER, *and heard Him*, &c. in that State of their Pre-existence.

---

* Vit. decem Rhetor. *p.* 1544. Καὶ ἔτι Παῖς ὢν ἐδίδαξε γραμματα σὺν τῷ Πατρί.

† Comment. in Johan. *p.* 293.

Here *Origen* uſes μαθητεύειν for the ſame thing which in the Text is expreſs'd by μανθάνειν; which puts it out of all doubt, that the Senſe is as I have tranſlated it: and it can't be obſcure, becauſe he is ſpeaking of ſuch as were prepar'd before their Birth, by hearing the FATHER. *Ferrarius* therefore, without any Difficulty, renders it *edoctæ apud* PATREM, exactly in the Senſe I maintain.

Therefore by *Origen*'s ſupplying the Conſtruction by παρὰ, it appears that the Phraſe wou'd have been defective without it, and that it muſt have been underſtood; or elſe ὑπὸ, which *Ireneus* has us'd to expreſs the ſame Senſe. For Example, ſpeaking of St. *Polycarp*, he ſays, † *he was not only inſtructed* (μαθητευθεὶς ὑπὸ Ἀποστόλων) *by the Apoſtles, and acquainted with many of thoſe who had ſeen the* LORD; *but was alſo conſtituted by the Apoſtles Biſhop of the Church of* Smyrna *in* Aſia. Tho ὑπὸ be here join'd with a Genitive, it does not alter the Phraſe; for 'tis us'd promiſcuouſly with a Genitive or Dative, without any difference in the Senſe; juſt as *Origen* in the place above cited, and in the following Words, ſhews us παρὰ is likewiſe. Thus *Socrates Scholaſticus*, ſpeaking of *Eunomius* the Heretick, has this remarkable Paſſage; ‖ *that being* Ætius's *Secretary, he was taught or led by him into* (ὑπ' αὐτῷ παιδευθεὶς) *the Hereſy* which he afterwards gave Name to. This Paſſage is the more obſervable, becauſe it ſerves to ſhew how μαθητευθεὶς is to be under-

† Apud Euſeb. lib. 4. cap. 14. Πολύκαρπος δὲ ὁ μόνον ὑπὸ Ἀποστόλων μαθητευθεὶς καὶ συναναστραφεὶς πολλοῖς τῶν τοῦ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ἑωρακόσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὸ Ἀποστόλων κατασταθεὶς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐν τῇ ἐν Σμύρνῃ Ἐκκλησίᾳ Ἐπίσκοπος.

‖ Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. 2. cap. 35. fin. Εὐνόμιος Ταχυγράφος ὢν ἐκείνου, καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῷ παιδευθεὶς τὴν Ἀιρετικὴν λέξιν.

ſtood

ſtood in St. *Irenæus:* for it's plain, the Senſe in both places is the ſame; and therefore παιδευθεὶς, which every body knows ſignifys *inſtructed, taught,* or the like, ſtrongly confirms my Interpretation of μαθητευθεὶς in the other place. And beſides, 'tis there capable of no other Senſe; and the *Gloſſarium Latino-Græcum* annex'd to Dr. *Grabe*'s Edition of St. *Irenæus*, renders the Word by *edoctus, taught, inſtructed*, &c. *C. Nepos* expreſſes this Senſe by *eruditus*, when ſpeaking of *Alcibiades*, he ſays, * *he was taught by* Socrates: and ſo in other places.

We have another Inſtance much of the ſame nature with that of *Socrates*, in *Clemens Alexandrinus*, which is parallel to what was cited from *Origen*, and may therefore ſerve to expound it. † *For we are taught of* GOD, *who are taught of the* SON *of* GOD, *Wiſdom which is truly divine.* What *Origen* expreſs'd by μαθητευομένοι παρὰ τῷ Πατρὶ, St. *Clement* here expreſſes by παιδευόμενοι παρὰ τοῦ ΥΙΟΥ̃ τοῦ ΘΕΟΥ̃, for both ſpeak of being taught of GOD.

And ſince I have begun, I will farther illuſtrate the Senſe of the Word under conſideration, by more Examples of other Words which are ſynonymous to it, and us'd exactly to expreſs the ſame thing.

Plutarch, ſpeaking of *Lyſias*, ſays, ‖ *he was taught* (παιδευόμενος) or *ſtudy'd under* Tiſias *and* Nicias *of* Syracuſe. Here he uſes παιδεύω directly in the ſame Senſe, as in the Inſtances above-cited you may ſee he, at other times, uſes μαθητεύω. So *Ælian* ſays of *Perſæus*, Ἀντίγονον ἐπαίδευσε, *he*

* Vit. Alcibiad. *p.* 74.

† Stromat. *lib.* 1. *p.* 318. Θεοδίδακτοι γὰρ ἡμεῖς, ἱερὰ ὄντως γράμματα παρὰ τοῦ ΥΙΟΥ̃ τοῦ ΘΕΟΥ̃ παιδευόμενοι.

‖ De Vit. decem Rhetor. *p.* 1536. Παιδευόμενος παρὰ Τισίᾳ καὶ Νικίᾳ τοῖς Συρακουσίοις.

taught Antigonus. And again, a little after, * Lysis *a Diſciple of* Pythagoras, *inſtructed* Epaminondas.

Plato, in one of his Dialogues, makes *Socrates* ſay, † Carry your Sons with you; for in hopes of gaining them, they will be the more eaſily perſuaded to teach us.

In all theſe places παιδεύειν is us'd juſt as μαθητεύειν is in others, which I have mention'd before. From whence it is but reaſonable to infer, that both theſe Words, in theſe and ſuch-like Caſes, ſignify one and the ſame thing, namely, to *inſtruct*, or *teach*, or the like.

Another ſynonymous Word by which the Senſe of μαθητεύω may be illuſtrated, is ἀκούω, which is frequently enough us'd for *to learn* in the New Teſtament, as well as among profane Writers. *Pindar* has a Paſſage very pertinent to this effect, tho the Word is metaphorically apply'd in it: || *For* Salamis *can produce as brave Soldiers*, ſays the Poet, *as any in the World*; Hector *learn'd* (ἄκυσεν) *the Truth of this from* Ajax *before the Walls of* Troy. The antient Scholiaſt interprets ἄκυσεν by μανθάνειν in this place: and 'tis very plain the Metaphor is taken from the Schools, where Pupils hear and are taught by Tutors appointed to that purpoſe. And this Word is often us'd to expreſs this Senſe.

---

* Ælian. Var. Hiſtor. lib. 3. cap. 17. Λύσις δὲ ὁ γνώριμος τὸ Πυθαγόρε, καὶ αὐτὸς Ἐπαμινώνδαν ἐξεπαίδευσε

† Euthydem. pag. 190. D. Ἴσως δὲ δέλεαρ ἄξουμεν αὐτοῖς τοὺς ζοὺς Υἱεῖς ἐφιέμενοι γὰρ ἐκείνων διδάσκειν ὅπως καὶ ἡμᾶς παιδεύσουσιν.

|| Pindar. Nem. 2. 18.

——— Καὶ μὰν
Ἀ Σαλαμὶς γε θρέψαι
Φῶτα μαχατὰν
Δυνατός. Ἐν Τροΐᾳ μὰν Ἕκτωρ
Αἰαντος ἄκουσεν.

Diogenes

Diogenes Laertius says of *Anaximenes*, that * *he was educated or taught by* (ἤκουσεν) Anaximander: *Others say, he study'd under* (ἀκοῦσαι) Parmenides. Of *Socrates*, in his Life, he says, that † *when according to some* (ἀκούσας) *he had been instructed by, or study'd under* Anaxagoras; *and also by* Damon, *as* Alexander *in his Treatise of Successions affirms; after his Condemnation, he heard* (διήκουσεν) *or study'd under* Archelaus *the Naturalist.* And again, of *Xenocrates* he says, that ‖ *he heard* (ἤκουσεν) that is, *study'd under* Plato *almost from his Infancy.* And so in many other places.

Plutarch, commending the natural Propensity to Vertue, of *Dion* the *Syracusian Brutus*, says, that notwithstanding he had liv'd in the corrupt Court of *Dionysius* the famous Tyrant, upon hearing *Plato* talk, tho very young, he was so enamour'd with Philosophy, that (*a*) *he resolv'd to find Opportunitys to see that great Philosopher, and be instructed* (ἀκοῦσαι) *or taught by him.* And again, when comparing *Pelopidas* and *Epaminondas* together, (*b*) *they seem both*, says he, *to have been equally made for all kind of Vertues, except that* Pelopidas *delighted most to exercise his Body, and* Epaminondas *by Learning to exercise his Mind: They spent therefore all their*

---

* In ejus Vit. lib. 2. Ἀναξιμένης Εὐρυστράτου Μιλήσιος ἤκουσεν Ἀναξιμάνδρου. ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ Παρμενίδου φασὶν ἀκοῦσαι αὐτοῦ.

† Lib. 2. Ἀκούσας δὲ Ἀναξαγόρου, κατά τινας ἀλλὰ καὶ Δάμωνος, ὡς Ἀλεξάνδρος ἐν διαδοχαῖς, μετὰ τὴν ἐκείνου κατάκρισιν διήκουσεν Ἀρχελάου τοῦ Φυσικοῦ.

‖ Vit. Xenocrat. Οὗτος ἐκ νέου Πλάτωνος ἤκουσεν.

(*a*) In Vit. Dion. p. 1756. Ἐσπούδασε, καὶ ἐπεράξατο ποιησάμενος σχολὴν, αὐτὸν ἐντυχεῖν Πλάτωνι καὶ ἀκοῦσαι.

(*b*) In Pelopid. p. 509. Ἦσαν δὲ πρὸς πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν πεφυκότες ὁμοίως, πλὴν ὅτι τῷ γυμνάζεσθαι μᾶλλον ἔχαιρε Πελοπίδας, τῷ δὲ μανθάνειν, Ἐπαμεινώνδας· καὶ τὰς διατριβὰς ἐν τῇ σχολάζειν, ὁ μὲν, πρὸς παλαίστρας καὶ κυνηγέσια, ὁ δὲ, ἀκούων τι καὶ φιλοσοφῶν ἐποιεῖτο.

leisure

leiſure Hours, one in Hunting, Wreſtling, and the like; and the other in learning (ἀκούων) *or being inſtructed in ſomething, and in Philoſophical Diſputations.*

Thus too he uſes the Compound διακούω, when he remarks out of *Steſimbrotus* the Hiſtorian, † *that* Themiſtocles *was inſtructed* (διακοῦσαι) *or taught by* Anaxagoras. Thus in the Life of *Cicero*, he ſays, ‖ *when he came to* Athens, *he heard*, that is, *was inſtructed by or ſtudy'd under* (διήκουσε) Antiochus *of* Scalona, *with whoſe voluble Eloquence he was extremely pleas'd, but did not approve of the new Opinions he had ſtarted.* Now, in all theſe Caſes, it's plain, the Words are us'd exactly in the ſame Senſe as μαθητεύω, which they therefore interpret in the places before-cited, and are a very home Argument, that μαθητεύω in all ſuch places neceſſarily implys hearing and learning in one Party, and teaching in another.

Notwithſtanding this is ſufficiently demonſtrated in what I have already ſaid, I can't forbear adding one more illuſtrious Inſtance, which I remember I have read in *Clemens Alexandrinus*; where he is ſhewing, that the *Jewiſh* Philoſophy is much the oldeſt of any other, and that the *Grecian* was borrow'd from it: He cites a Paſſage out of *Democritus*, where he boaſts of his Learning and of his Travels; which he intimates, gave him the Advantage of informing himſelf of many things from wiſe Men in all Parts of the World, and from the *Egyptians* in particular, with whom he ſays he had

† Vit. Themiſtocl. p. 204. Καίτοι Στησίμβροτος, Ἀναξαγόρου τε διακοῦσαι τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα φησί.

‖ Vit. Ciceron. p. 1580. Ἀφικόμενος δ' εἰς Ἀθήνας Ἀντιόχου τοῦ Ἀσκαλωνίτου διήκουσε, τῇ μὲν εὑρέσει τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ καὶ χάριτι κηλούμενος, οἷς δ' ἐν τοῖς δόγμασιν ἐνεωτέριζεν οὐκ ἐπαινῶν.

con-

convers'd eighty Years. After this Citation *Clement* adds, * *he travel'd into* Babylon, Persia, *and* Egypt, *learning* (μαθητεύων) *of the* Magi *and Priests.* Pythagoras *assures us, that* Zoroaster *was one of the Persian* Magi: *And those who are of the Sect of* Prodicus, *boast, they have some hidden mystical Books of that great Man.* Alexander, *in his Treatise of* Pythagorean *Symbols, says,* Pythagoras *was taught* (μαθητεῦσαι) *or instructed by* Nazaratus *the* Assyrian: *and that besides these, he heard* (ἀκηκοέναι) *or learn'd of the* Druids *and* Brachmans.

In this Passage, the Word in dispute, μαθητεύω, is twice us'd only to signify to *learn*, just in the same Sense as ἀκούω is, immediately after in the last Sentence: in which likewise the Words τε πρὸς τούτοις are to be observ'd; for they connect the Sense of the last Clause with that of the foregoing: for to say, *besides these he heard*, or *was taught* by such or such also, necessarily imports, that he had been said before *to have heard*, or *been taught* by others. And you may remember, that *Clement* is there professedly shewing from whence the *Greeks* had *learn'd* their Philosophy; for this makes it more necessary to understand the Passage as I have translated it, it being so very agreeable to his Design, but otherwise making nothing to the purpose.

Now, Sir, from all I have hitherto said, I am persuaded you will think 'tis abundantly evident,

---

* Stromat. lib. 1. pag. 304. Ἐπῆλθε γοῦ Βαβυλῶνά τε καὶ Περσίδα καὶ Ἄιγυπτον, τοῖς τε Μάγοις καὶ τοῖς Ἱερεῦσι μαθητεύων. Ζωροάστρην δὲ τὸν Μάγον τῶν Περσῶν ὁ Πυθαγόρας ἐδήλωσεν βίβλους ἀποκρύφους τ'ανδρὸς τοῦδε οἱ τὴν Περσικὴν μελετῶντες ἄιρεσιν, αὐχοῦσι κεκτῆσθαι. Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ Πυθαγορικῶν Συμβόλων, Ναζαράτῳ τῷ Ἀσσυρίῳ μαθητεῦσαι ἱστορεῖ τὸν Πυθαγόραν ἀκηκοέναι τε πρὸς τούτοις Γαλατῶν καὶ Βραχμάνων τὸν Πυθαγόραν βεβλεῆσθαι.

that

that μαθητέυω does always, even in the pretended Neuter Acceptation, ſignify to *inſtruct*, *teach*, or the like; and that our Adverſarys have not the leaſt ground to ſurmize it is ever ſo much as once us'd in any Caſe, ſo as not to include *teaching*. After the Inſtances already given, and the conſiderable Illuſtration of 'em by parallel Paſſages, wherein παιδεύω and ἀκόω being us'd to the ſame Senſe, interpret μαθητεύω in the other places: I ſay, after all this I ſhou'd not need to recite more Inſtances, but that you intimate it will be very acceptable; and therefore to the reſt I add theſe two or three that follow.

Clemens Alexandrinus, ſpeaking advantageouſly of Philoſophy againſt thoſe who exploded it, from ſome Premiſes he has before been arguing on, infers thus: * *Wherefore it is no Abſurdity to ſay that Philoſophy was given by Divine Providence, as a Forerunner to prepare and lead us on to that Perfection which is in* CHRIST, *if it is not aſham'd; but learns* (μαθητεύσα) *to advance from barbarous Wiſdom to the Truth.* Again, commending the Holy Scriptures to the *Greeks*, he has theſe Words, which I tranſcribe at large, becauſe that will give the more force to the Inſtance: † *The Word which enlightens us is more to be valu'd than Gold or Precious Stones, and more deſirable than Honey or the Honey-Comb; for how ſhou'd that but be extreamly deſirable, which quickens and invigorates a Mind that's bury'd*

* Stromat. Lib. 6. pag. 690. Οὐκ ἄτοπον καὶ τὴν Φιλοσοφίαν ἐκ τῆ Θείας Προνοίας δεδόσθαι, προπαιδεύσαν εἰς τὸν διὰ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ Τελείωσιν, ἕως μὴ ἐπαισχύνηται Γνώσει βαρβάρῳ μαθητεύσα Φιλοσοφία προκόπτειν εἰς Ἀλήθειαν.

† Protreptic. pag. 70. Γλυκὺς ὁ Λόγος ὁ φωτίσας ἡμᾶς, ὑπὲρ Χρυσίον καὶ Λίθον τίμιον· ποθεινός ἐστιν ὑπὲρ Μέλι καὶ Κηρίον. Πῶς γὰρ ὁ ποθεινὸς, ὁ τὸ ἐν σκότει καλοφωτισμὸν νοῦν, ἐνεργὸν ποιησάμενος, καὶ τὰ φωσφόρα τῆς ψυχῆς ἀποξύνας ὄμματα; καὶ

bury'd in Darkness, and sharpens the Sight of the Understanding? For as, if there were no Sun, notwithstanding the other Stars, all wou'd be Night; so if we had not been enlightned by the Word, we shou'd not have differ'd from the Fowls which are wont to be fatned in the dark, and nourish'd for Death. Let us therefore receive the Light, and learn of (μαθητεύωμεν) *or be instructed by the* LORD.

As remarkable and plain are several Passages in *Origen*, for Example where he is explaining *Matt.* xiii. 52. ‖ *By* Scribe *there may be understood one that is instructed in* (μεμαθητευμένος) *that Knowledg which is according to the Letter of the Law.* And a little after; * *So this Passage also may be expounded Tropologically*, repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand, *to signify that the Scribes, that is, those who rest in the bare Letter, if they repent, may be instructed* (μαθητεύωνται) *in the Spiritual Doctrine which, by* CHRIST JESUS, *is the quickning Word, and is call'd the Kingdom of Heaven.* And in the same Sense the Word several times occurs in this and the next Page, to which I will add but one Instance more from this Father, taken out of the Books he writ

---

γὰ ὥσπερ Ἡλίου μὴ ὄντος ἕνεκα τῶν ἄλλων ἄστρων Νὺξ ἂν ἦν τὰ πάντα. ὕτως εἰ μὴ τοῦ Λόγου ἔγνωμεν, καὶ τούτῳ κατηυγάσθημεν, ὑδὲν ἂν τῶν σιτευομένων ὀρνίθων ἐλειπόμεθα, ἐν σκότει παιόμενοι, καὶ Θανάτῳ τρεφόμενοι. Χωρήσωμεν τὸ Φῶς, ἵνα χωρήσωμεν τοῦ ΘΕΟΥ̓Ν. Χωρήσωμεν τὸ Φῶς, καὶ μαθητεύσωμεν τῷ ΚΥΡἸΩ.

‖ Comment. in Matth. pag. 218. Ἕκαστος γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ γράμμα τοῦ Νόμου Διδασκαλίᾳ, &c.

* Ibid. pag. 219. Οὕτω δὲ καὶ τροπολογήσεις τὸ, μετανοεῖτε, ἤγγικε γὰρ ἡ Βασιλεία τῶν Οὐρανῶν, ἵν' οἱ γραμματεῖς, τουτέστιν, οἱ τῷ γράμματι ψιλῷ προσαναπαυόμενοι, μετανοήσαντες ἀπὸ τῆς τοιαύτης ἐνδοχῆς μαθητευθῶσι τῇ διὰ ΙΗΣΟΥ̓ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ̓ τοῦ ἐμψύχου Λόγου πνευματικῇ Διδασκαλίᾳ, καλουμένῃ Βασιλείᾳ Οὐρανῶν.

against

againſt *Celſus*. Laſhing the Pride and Arrogance of that virulent Adverſary of Chriſtian Religion, who boaſted he was thorowly acquainted with that Inſtitution, he ſays, * *This is juſt as if any one who has travel'd into* Egypt, *where the wiſe Men, according to the Learning of that Country, reaſon profoundly among themſelves about many things which they account Sacred; but the common People amuſe themſelves with ſome Fables which they have heard, and the Reaſon of which they don't comprehend. 'Tis, I ſay, juſt as if ſuch a one ſhall fanſy he underſtands all the Wiſdom of the* Egyptians, *when he's taught* (μαθητεύσας) *only by the empty Chat of the Vulgar, without having ever been admitted to the Converſation of the Prieſts, or been inſtructed by 'em in the* Egyptian *Myſterys.* This Paſſage is the fitter to conclude with, becauſe it is very plain from the Deſign of it, that the Word in diſpute muſt here ſignify to teach; and *Origen* himſelf explains it ſo, by μαθὼν, in the laſt Clauſe, which is moſt apparently us'd to ſignify exactly what before he had expreſs'd by μαθητεύσας.

All this largely ſhews that the *Greek* Word μαθητεύω does, as I aſſerted, always ſignify to *teach*, or the like; and that thoſe unſuitable Phraſes, *to be Diſciples*, or *to make Diſciples*, if they can ever be admitted, muſt always be underſtood to include teaching, for 'tis this certainly the Word principally imports; and therefore the pretended intranſitive Acceptation of it can be

* Orig. contra Celſ. Lib. 1. pag. 11. Δοκεῖ δέ μοι πιθανόν τι πεποιηκέναι, ὡς εἴ πς τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ ὁπιδημήσας, ἔνθα οἱ μὲν Αἰγυπτίων Σοφοὶ, κατὰ τὰ πάτρια γράμματα, πολλὰ φιλοσοφοῦσι περὶ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς νενομισμένων θείων, οἱ δὲ ἰδιῶται μύθες τινὰς ἀκούσαντες ὧν τὸς λόγες οὐκ ὀπίσανται, μέσα ἐπ' αὐτοῖς φερνοῦσιν· ᾠετο πάντα τὰ Αἰγυπτίων ἐσωκέναι τοῖς ἰδιώταις αὐτῶν μαθητεύσας, καὶ μηδενὶ τῶν ἱερέων συμμίξας, μηδ' ἀπὸ τινὸς αὐτῶν τὰ Αἰγυπτίων ἀπόῤῥητα μαθών.

of

of no service, nor is supported by any one Precedent.

But besides I observe, that tho the Thing I oppose cou'd be defended, and all I have been saying had no force, it can nevertheless be no Advantage to our Adversarys in the present Case, because however the Word is us'd in some other Places, yet in the Commission 'tis undoubtedly us'd transitively, expressing an Action which is to affect and terminate in the Subjects mention'd, *viz.* all Nations: and thus to *teach, instruct*, &c. all Nations, is good Sense; but *to be Disciples* all Nations, is Nonsense, and cannot be the Meaning of Infinite Wisdom. The Construction with an Accusative is also a Demonstration, that the Word is here Transitive and not Neuter; tho besides it neither can, nor I believe will be deny'd, and therefore I need not insist longer upon it.

But farther I add, that *Discipleship* necessarily includes Teaching; and therefore tho the Word cou'd be here rendred *to be a Disciple*, yet our Antagonists wou'd not be able to avoid the Difficulty we press 'em with: it being enough for us, that however they will strain and torture the Word, teaching is still necessarily included in it.

On this account also, to render the Word *make Disciples*, which is much more sensible and proper, can do no manner of hurt to us, nor kindness to our Adversarys. Perhaps there may be some colour for this Notion of the Word in the Nature of Things: And it's true, there does seem to be something peculiar in the Word; for it means not simply *to teach*, but *to teach so as to prevail, to bring over to an Opinion*, and *actually to fix and settle Principles* in the Persons taught; and this indeed is consequentially

tially making Diſciples: but then the Word does not primarily ſignify to *make Diſciples*, but only to *teach* ſucceſsfully, and ſo as to prevail. Tho the Terms are almoſt reciprocal, and *teaching ſucceſsfully*, is *making Diſciples*; and *making Diſciples, teaching ſucceſsfully:* yet you may obſerve this difference, that *teaching* is the Cauſe; and being *made Diſciples*, the Effect produc'd by that Cauſe, and following upon it. And therefore, tho to *make Diſciples*, were ſuppos'd in effect to ſignify the ſame thing I plead for, yet I wou'd chuſe rather to lay that Phraſe aſide, becauſe it is not the immediate Import of the Word: and beſides, we find by Experience, the Intereſts and Prejudices of ſome Men can make it liable to Ambiguity; which, on the contrary, the primary and immediate Senſe is wholly free from. If it be rendred *teach*, as you ſee in all the Inſtances I have given it unavoidably ſignifys, it can loſe nothing of its Senſe; for *Diſcipleſhip* will follow if that be to be included: but if it be rendred *make Diſciples*, our Adverſarys take an Advantage, and attempt to argue us out of the principal Signification, pretending it means to *make Diſciples* in general, not only by *teaching*, but even without it too.

Thus Dr. *Hammond*, in his Anſwer to the Query about Infant-Baptiſm, argues, ‖ That the Word in the Commiſſion does ſignify ſimply to *make Diſciples* of all Nations; and he wou'd have the Words immediately following to explain and determine the Manner how this was to be done, namely, by baptizing them; *making this Form of Baptiſm*, ſays he, *their Ceremony of receiving 'em*: he does not mean of receiving them into Church-Communion, but into Diſcipleſhip, that is, ap-

‖ *Six Querys*, pag. 196, 197.

pointing

pointing this Form of Baptism alone, to be that which makes 'em Disciples: which, whatever it be else, I am sure is no good Divinity.

Besides, the Doctor never goes about to shew the Word is ever once us'd so: whereas I have largely shewn it can't be so understood; which I doubt not will weigh more with you, Sir, than the Doctor's bare Assertion: and if any you shew these Letters to, out of deference to the Doctor's Learning, shall insist upon his Interpretation of the Word, I challenge 'em to shew any Instances, or the least tolerable Reason to imagine that μαθητεύω and βαπτίζω are in any degree synonymous, or ever put to signify one and the same thing, or that one ever so explains the other, as it is pretended to do in the Commission; nay, or that μαθητεύω can once signify in any Passage to *make Disciples* in general, exclusively of *teaching*. If they will make either of these Particulars appear, I will not only alter my present Opinion, but always gratefully acknowledg my self very much oblig'd to 'em for the Favour. I am,

SIR,

Yours, *&c.*

LETTER VIII.

Dr. Hammond *explains* μαθητεύσατε, Matth. xxviii. 19. *by* John iv. 1. *without, if not contrary to all Reason. His Unfairness noted. A Passage of the Bishop of* Sarum *in favour of the Anti-pædobaptists Sense of the Word. Another from Mr.* Le Clerc. *What Mr.* Wall *urges from the Notion of a Disciple, consider'd.* Μαθητὴς *is only said of such as are at least capable of being taught. Mr.* Wall's *groundless and unfair Attempt upon* Acts xv. 10. *to prove the contrary, examin'd. The Words relate only to Adult Persons. A Disciple, in common Discourse, ever signifys one that's taught, &c. so it does likewise among the* Latin *Authors; from whom we borrow it. Prov'd from the Etymology of* Discipulus. *By Instances from* Cicero. *From* Juvenal. *From* Terence. *From* Cornel. Nepos. *All the World have had the same Notion of a Disciple. Instances in the* Eastern *Languages. In the* Anglo-Saxon. *No Instance that 'tis us'd otherwise in any* Greek *Author: But many of the Sense the Anti-pædobaptists plead for. One taken from* John ix. 27. *One from* Acts xviii. 23. *Another from* Dionysius Halicarnasseus. *Illustrated also by synonymous Words. Instances of* Ἀκροατὴς. *From* Diogenes Laertius. *From* Plutarch. *An Instance of* Ἀκροώμενος *from* Laertius. *Of* Ἀκροατὴς *from* Ælian. *From* Dionysius Halicarnasseus. *This illustrated by Instances from* Roman *Authors. From* Cicero. *The Inference from all this in the present Dispute. A Passage from* Lucian; *wherein he explains the Phra-*

to make Disciples. *Disciple and Teacher us'd as Correlates.* *By* Themistius. *By* Cicero. *This apply'd to the present Dispute.* *The most Judicious have always allow'd, that the Word in the Commission particularly signifys to teach and instruct.* *As* Constantine. Stephens. Leigh. Turretine. Episcopius. Limborch. Cameron. Martin Bucer. Rigaltius. Erasmus. Grotius. Lucas Brugensis. *This prov'd to be the Sense of the Place from the several Versions.* *The* Hebrew. Syriack. Arabick. Persick. Ethiopick. Arias Montanus. Vulgar Latin. *That of* Sixtus V. Beza. Erasmus. Castalio. *The* Italian. Spanish. French. Dutch. Danish. Saxon. Vulgar Greek. *The Fathers of the Primitive Church always understood, the Word in the Commission signify'd to* teach. *Thus* Clemens Alexandrinus. Origen. *St.* Justin. Eusebius. Apostolical Constitutions. *St.* Clement. Epiphanius. *St.* Basil. Tertullian. Clarus, *Bishop of* Mascula. *St.* Hierom. *Lastly, This is prov'd to be the true Sense of the Place by the Authority of the Sacred Scriptures themselves.* *The Practice of the Apostles.* *Parallel Places.* *The Sum of the Evidence.* *From all it follows, that the Commission obliges to teach all that are to be baptiz'd: And therefore that the Scriptures are not so silent concerning the Baptizing of Infants as the Pædobaptists wou'd have us think.* *So that if Mr.* Wall *shou'd prove the* Jews *and* Christians *did baptize their Children, we have still reason enough not to admit the Practice.*

SIR,

THO I concluded my last with a Challenge, I don't expect it shou'd be accepted. Dr. *Hammond*, I am persuaded, was conscious that no Instance of that kind cou'd be produc'd; and there-

fore he waves it, and only makes an unaccountable Reference to what he calls a parallel Phraſe, *John* iv. 1. *The* Phariſees *had heard that* JESUS *made and baptiz'd more Diſciples than* John.

But why muſt this Place above all others be ſingled out for a Parallel? Can we imagine the Doctor did not know it wou'd have been much more to the Purpoſe, to have cited proper Inſtances which are truly parallel, inſtead of one which is not ſo? It is to be fear'd the Doctor's Prejudices interpos'd in this Caſe: for, as I obſerv'd before, when he has another Deſign to ſerve, he readily allows, the natural Senſe of μαθητεύσατε (and in the Commiſſion particularly) is *to teach*. So he gives it in his Paraphraſe, and continually in his Notes on the Place; and ſays, *in other Places, when the Commiſſion of Preaching and gathering Diſciples is given to the Apoſtles:* plainly allowing this Place to be one, where it is given. He expreſly interprets the Words ſo when he ſays, *for ſo the Words as they are repeated by St.* Mark *muſt neceſſarily ſignify*, Go into all the World and preach the Goſpel; *to thoſe of the Synagogue firſt, and then to others alſo. Thus St.* Luke *has ſet it down more diſtinctly*, Chap. xxiv. ver. 47. that Repentance and Remiſſion of Sins ſhou'd be preach'd in his Name among all Nations, beginning at *Jeruſalem*.

Again, He allows that St. *Peter* only repeats this very Commiſſion, when he ſays, *Acts* x. 42. *He commanded us to preach to the People*, &c. Now does not the Doctor ſeem in all this to contradict himſelf, and pull down at one time, what at another he ſo zealouſly eſtabliſh'd? And therefore his Suffrage in this Caſe ſignifys little. Had he not been ſtrongly byaſs'd, he wou'd doubtleſs have attempted to explain the Commiſſion by no other parallel

parallel Passages but those he has cited in his Annotations.

I know there are several beside the Doctor, who give the Word the same Sense, as Bishop *Nicholson* *, Dr. *Featly* †, and indeed most Pædobaptists, who attempt to argue from the Commission. But of all who translate it thus, the most considerable, I at present remember, are the Right Reverend Bishop of *Salisbury*, and the Learned Mr. *Le Clerc*, who nevertheless both of 'em confirm my Assertion. His Lordship expressly says, That ‖ *by the first* teaching *or making of* Disciples, *that must go before Baptism, is to be meant the Convincing the World*, &c. And tho Mr. *Wall* is so angry with Mr. *Le Clerc* at other times (like the Gnat on the Bull's Horn in the *Arabian* ** Fables) I fancy he was better pleas'd with him, when he found that Learned Gentleman asserted, μαθητεύειν *signifys to make Disciples*; and imagin'd it was giving in to his Opinion. But the *French* Version of the New Testament, which Mr. *Le Clerc* afterwards publish'd with Remarks, soon put our Author out of Humour again, by letting him see that rendring the Word so cou'd do him no service: for there he renders it in the Text, *faites des Disciples*, *make Disciples*; and in his Remark on it says, †† *This is the proper Signification of the Word* μαθητεύειν, and *not to teach:* but then he adds immediately, to prevent all Mistake, and in contradiction to the

---

* *On the Catechism.*

† *Dipper Dipt*, pag. 59.

‖ *Exposition of the Articles*, pag. 300.

** Lockmanni *Fab.*

†† C'est le propre sens du Verb *Matheeteuein*, & non enseigner.

common Criticism, that * *it is nevertheless very true, that Disciples are not made but by teaching.* That is as if he had said, μαθητεύειν does indeed mean and include *teaching*; but the full Sense of it is not so properly express'd by teach, because it signifys something more than simply to teach, *viz.* as I said before, to *convince*, to *teach so as to prevail*, and *bring over to an Opinion*; which is in effect to *make Disciples*. So that the Word still necessarily includes teaching. And I hardly remember any considerable Man that ventures to assert the contrary.

Mr. *Wall*, to make the Cavil seem the more reasonable, endeavours to shew from the Notion of a Disciple, that Persons may be made Disciples without being taught, nay or without so much as being in a Capacity of receiving Instruction; and infers, since the Word which signifys to *make Disciples*, does not necessarily include teaching, it may refer to Persons not capable of being taught; and so he thinks the Commission may be easily understood to extend to Infants as well as Adult Persons.

But this is sufficiently confuted by the large Evidence I have given above of the Import of the *Greek* Word, that it does necessarily include Teaching as well in the Commission, as in all other Places where it occurs. And in the next Place I will add, that Μαθητὴς or *Disciple* is only said of such as are capable of being taught, and properly belongs to 'em only in this respect.

All our Author says to the contrary, and which I can think it so much as possible any Man shou'd be persuaded by, is express'd in these Words:

* Quoi qu'il soit vrai que l'on ne fait des Disciples, qu'en les enseignant.

St. Le-

† St. Peter *speaking against the imposing of Circumcision on the Heathen Converts and their Children, words it thus,* to put a Yoke upon the Neck of the Disciples: *Whereas it was Infants especially on whom this Yoke was attempted to be put,* Acts xv. 10.

Mr. *Wall* delivers nothing on this Occasion, which is likely to deceive the most Ignorant, unless it be this Passage, wherein he makes so bold with the Scripture, that perhaps such as are too credulous, and not given to examine Matters as they ought, may take it for a clear Scripture-Proof of the Thing. But you, Sir, I am satisfy'd, will see thro our Author's fallacious Misapplication of the Text he cites. And how disingenuous is it to insinuate, with as much Assurance as if it were plainly express'd, that the Holy Apostle is speaking against imposing Circumcision on the Heathen Converts and *their Children?* And how much worse is it to assert downright, that *it was Infants especially, on whom* this Yoke was attempted to be put? Any Man who reads the Passage, even tho he be entirely in Mr. *Wall*'s Interest too, can't but see this Assertion is grossly false, and that Infants are no where mention'd; nor is any thing said which can be apply'd to 'em in the whole Chapter.

The Brethren, *ver.* 1. on whom this attempt was made, are said to be *taught*, that without being circumcis'd they cou'd not be sav'd. This can't include Infants. Again, *ver.* 5. speaking only of those who were converted, the *Pharisees* said it was needful to circumcise 'em. And St. *James*, in *ver.* 19. very plainly shows us that he did not understand the Question to relate at all

† Part II. pag. 378.

to Infants, but only to the Adult; for he confines his Determination to them alone: *Wherefore*, ſays he, *my ſentence is, that we trouble not them, who from among the* Gentiles *are turn'd to* God. And ſure none will ſay Infants can turn from a falſe Religion to God. But the whole Scope of the Place, the Injunctions of that venerable Council of the Apoſtles, their Letter, and all the Circumſtances do very evidently conſpire to ſhew their Conſultation related not to Infants, but only to the Adult. Nay, St. *Peter*, in the Words immediately preceding the Verſe our Author cites, ſays of the Perſons who are the Subject of the Diſpute, that God had *purify'd their Hearts by Faith:* from whence 'tis plain, the Perſons he ſpoke of were actual Believers; and conſequently by Μαθητῶν, in the following Words, the Holy Apoſtle intends only the Converts, excluſively of their Infants, if they had any. This you ſee, Sir, is ſo very clear, that nothing but Prepoſſeſſion cou'd incline any Man to aſſert, it was Infants eſpecially on whom this Yoke *was attempted* to be put; in hopes he might hence conclude that Infants are here call'd *Diſciples*, and by Conſequence muſt be capable of being made ſo.

'Tis a great Diſhonour and Diſſervice to Religion, that any who are Teachers of it, and appointed to guide the People, ſhou'd endeavour to ſupport their Fancys and Opinions by a Fallacy. Nothing I think can be more diſingenuouſly urg'd, or be a more palpable Affront to the common Senſe of Mankind, than to affirm Μαθητὴς may be apply'd to Infants and Perſons not capable of being taught; for every body conſtantly uſes the Word, and always underſtands it to mean one that is taught or learns. In common Diſcourſe 'tis ever ſo: And ask a Countryman, what he means by the word *Scholar*, he will tell

tell you he means one that goes to School to learn. And if you ask what he means by *Diſciple*, he'll tell you, ſuch a Man's Diſciple is one that holds his Opinions, and thinks his Way beſt. And you'll find the Countryman underſtands his Mother-Tongue better than ſome others ſeem to do; and if he uſes more honeſt Simplicity, he uſes more Reaſon too in explaining his Meaning, than the Byaſs of Intereſt and Partys will ſuffer ſome Men of Letters to do: and if the matter were to be refer'd, all the World wou'd prefer the good plain Senſe of the Country-man. Now common Uſe, which fixes the Senſe of Words, is an undoubted Proof of their Signification.

Beſides, we may argue not only from the uſe of the Word *Diſciple* among our ſelves, but likewiſe from the uſe of it among the *Latin* Authors, from whom we have borrow'd it. Now it's plain, *Diſcipulus* is form'd from *diſcere* to *learn*. If the Name then is impos'd on Perſons for that reaſon, viz. *quia diſcunt*, it can be apply'd to none but ſuch, in whom the reaſon is to be found; otherwiſe it wou'd be given not only without, but even contrary to the reaſon of it. But the *Latins* always us'd it, according to its Etymology, to ſignify one that was taught, *qui diſcit*, ſays *Stephens*, one that learns: and *Cicero* promiſcuouſly uſes *Diſcipulus* and *Diſcens* a *Learner*, as ſynonymous Words.

In that ſtrange Relation concerning *Diodotus* the Stoick Philoſopher, he ſays, that even after he was blind, * *tho it ſeems almoſt impoſſible to be*

---

* *Cic. Quæſt. Tuſcul. lib.* 5. *cap.* 39. Tum quod ſine Oculis fieri poſſe vix videtur, Geometriæ Munus tuebatur, Verbis præcipiens Diſcentibus, unde, quo, quamque Lineam ſcriberent.

done

done without the uſe of Sight, yet he taught Geometry, directing his Scholars (Diſcentibus) *or Pupils, or Diſciples, by Words, whence and whither, and what Lines they ſhou'd draw.* What he here means by *Diſcens*, is in other places expreſs'd by *Diſcipulus*. Thus in a Letter to † *Papirius*, he ſays, *Hirtius* and *Dolabella are my Scholars, or Diſciples,* (Diſcipuli) *or Students in Oratory, and my Maſters in Feaſting.* The ſame Oppoſition of Maſter and Scholar, *Juvenal* makes; when laſhing thoſe who inſtil their own covetous Principles into their Children, he ſays, ‖ *Take my word for it, the Scholar will out-go the Maſter.* Old *Simo* in *Terence* uſes *Diſcipulus* in the ſame Senſe; ſpeaking to *Davus*, by whom he ſuppoſes *Pamphilus* was tutor'd and advis'd; * *Why don't you mind your Pupil* (Diſcipuli) *and give him better Inſtructions?* *Nepos*, in the Life of *Epaminondas*, remarks, that (*a*) *he did not diſcharge his Tutor, till he had gone far beyond his Fellow-Scholars* (Condiſcipulos) *in Learning; by which it was eaſy to foreſee he wou'd excel as much in other things.*

From theſe Inſtances, inſtead of infinite others which might be produc'd, it's plain, that thoſe from whom we borrow the Word *Diſciple*, meant by it one that is *taught*, or that *learns*. And the ſame Notion of a Diſciple all the World have had as well as the *Romans*: therefore in the *Hebrew*

† *Epiſt. Famil. lib.* 9. *Epiſt.* 16. Hirtium ego, & Dolabellam dicendi Diſcipulos habeo, cœnandi Magiſtros.

‖ *Satyr.* 14. 211. ——— Meliorem præſto Magiſtro
Diſcipulum ———

* *Andria, Act.* 3. *Scen.* 1. 19. *Si.* Num immemor es Diſcipuli?

(*a*) *Pag.* 138. Neque prius eum à ſe dimiſerit, quam in Doctrinis tanto anteceſſerit Condiſcipulos, ut facile intelligi poſſet, pari modo ſuperaturum omnes in cæteris Artibus.

(and

(and other *Eastern* Languages to the same effect) a Disciple is תלמיד, from למד in *Hiphil*, which signifys *to make to learn*, or *to teach*. And למד from למד in *Pihel*, which signifys the same thing: and so likewise in the *Anglo-Saxon*, Leopning-cnihc is a *Disciple* or *Scholar*, from leopnian to *learn*. 'Tis therefore one of the most unreasonable things that can be, to insist upon any other contrary Sense, which besides is not countenanc'd even by the common use of the Word among our selves.

Our Author takes his Argument for the Sense he gives the Word, from the Scriptures: But neither in that Sacred Book, nor any one *Greek* Author, is μαθητὴς ever once us'd as he pretends. The place he particularly cites, has been examin'd already, and turn'd against him: and he is oppos'd also by many others. *John* ix. 27. says the Man who was born blind, *Wherefore wou'd you hear it again? Will ye also be his Disciples?* that is, will ye also believe in him, and submit your selves to his Instruction, and become his Followers? Again, *Acts* xviii. 23. He *went over all the Country of* Galatia *and* Phrygia *in order, strengthning all the Disciples.* Doubtless all the Disciples then were capable of being confirm'd in the Faith they had *All* receiv'd; for it's plain, no other are here acknowledg'd for Disciples, but such as believ'd; for *All the Disciples* were strengthned.

And so in all other Instances, the Word is only apply'd to Adult Persons, who were actually taught, agreeably to the Sense it is us'd in by other Authors. So *Theopompus* the Historian is call'd by *Dionysius Halicarnasseus* || *the most famous of* Isocrates's *Scholars or Disciples* (μαθητῶν), that

|| Epist. ad Pompeium de Præcipuis Historic. *cap.* 6. Ἐπιφανέστατος πάντων Ἰσοκράτους μαθητῶν γεγόνασι.

is,

is, of all who were brought up or inſtructed by *Iſocrates*. And 'tis frequent to meet with Πλάτωνος μαθητὴς, Ἀριστοτέλους, Σωκράτους μαθητὴς, and the like, to ſignify ſuch as were inſtructed by *Plato*, *Ariſtotle*, *Socrates*, &c. and it may be illuſtrated farther by thoſe Words which are us'd as ſynonymous to it. Thus *Diogenes Laertius*, in the Life of *Strato Lampſacenus*, obſerving that there had been eight noted Men of that Name, ſays, * *the firſt was* Iſocrates's *Hearer or Scholar* (Ἀκροατὴς); *the ſecond, this Perſon whoſe Life I am writing; the third was a Phyſician, a Diſciple* (μαθητὴς) *of* Eraſiſtratus, *&c.* It is to be noted here, that Ἀκροατὴς and μαθητὴς are promiſcuouſly us'd to mean the ſame thing: now as the former neceſſarily implys actual Inſtruction, μαθητὴς muſt do ſo too.

Indeed what is meant by μαθητὴς in ſome places, we find commonly enough expreſs'd by Ἀκροατὴς, Ἀκούσης, *&c.* in others; which being therefore parallel Paſſages, are juſtly brought to explain one another: for which reaſon I will give you a few Inſtances.

Plutarch, ſpeaking of *Lycurgus*, ſays, that † *he firſt ſtudy'd Philoſophy, being a Hearer,* (Ἀκροατὴς) *Scholar, or Diſciple of* Plato *the Philoſopher.* Again, ſpeaking of *Hyperidas*, he ſays, ‖ *he had been a Hearer or Diſciple* (Ἀκροατὴς) *of* Plato *the Philoſopher; together with* Lycurgus, *and* Iſocrates. Sometimes he expreſſes the ſame thing by Ἀκροώ-

---

* Lib. 5. Πρῶτος Ἰσοκράτους ἀκροατής. δεύτερος, ἀυτὸς ἕτος. τρίτος, μαθητὴς Ἐρασιστράτου, &c.

† Vit. decem Rhetor. *pag.* 1545. Ἀκροατὴς δὲ γενόμενος Πλάτωνος τοῦ Φιλοσόφου, τὰ πρῶτα ἐφιλοσόφησεν.

‖ Ibid. pag. 1559. Ἀκροατὴς δὲ Πλάτωνος γενόμενος τοῦ φιλοσόφου, ἅμα Λυκούργῳ &c.

μενος,

μενος, as in the Life of *Isocrates*, * *he was a Disciple or Hearer* (Ἀκροώμενος) *of* Prodicus *the* Chian, *and of* Gorgias *the* Leontine, *&c.* And sometimes again we meet with Ἀκροατὴς to the same effect: Thus *Ælian* says, † Zoilus *of* Amphipolis, *who wrote against* Homer *and* Plato, *and others, was a Disciple or Hearer* (Ἀκροατὴς) *of* Polycrates *the* Athenian. So *Dionysius Halicarnassæus* calls *Cephisodorus* the *Athenian*, ‖ *a true and proper Disciple or Hearer* (Ἀκροατὴς) *of* Isocrates. To which perfectly agrees that parallel Phrase of the same Author, in a Letter to *Pompey*, concerning *Plato*; where excusing himself for his free Censure of that great Philosopher, he recounts several who had taken the same Liberty before him: (*a*) *the first of whom*, says he, *was his own Scholar or Disciple* (Μαθητὴς) Aristotle, *&c.* There is no other Difference in these Phrases, but that Μαθητὴς in one, is expres'd by Ἀκροατὴς in the other; which plainly shews the Words to be synonymous in all such Cases.

And so likewise the *Roman* Authors, who are constant Imitators of the *Greeks*, have the same Expression. *Cicero*, the great Master of *Roman* Eloquence, having mention'd *Theophrastus*, adds, (*b*) *for* Strato *who was his Disciple, Scholar, or Hearer,* (Auditor) *tho a Man of excellent Parts*, &c. And else-

---

* Vit. decem Rhetor. p. 1538. Ἀκροώμενος Πρωδίκου τε τοῦ Κῆι, καὶ Γοργίου τοῦ Λεοντίνου.

† Var. Hist. lib. 11. cap. 10. Ζωΐλος ὁ Ἀμφιπολίτης, ὁ καὶ εἰς Ὅμηρον γεγραφὼς, καὶ εἰς Πλάτωνα, καὶ εἰς ἄλλους, Πολυκράτους μὲν Ἀκροατὴς ἐγένετο.

‖ De Isocrat. Judic. cap. 18. pag. 163. Γνησιώτατος Ἀκροατὴς ἐγένετο.

(*a*) Pag. 203. Πρῶτον μὲν, ὁ γνησιώτατος αὐτοῦ Μαθητὴς Ἀριστοτέλης, &c.

(*b*) *Academic. Quæst. lib.* 1. *cap.* 9. Nam Strato, ejus Auditor, quanquam fuit acri Ingenio, *&c.*

where,

where, diſcourſing of the *chief Good*, and mentioning *Critolaus*, he ſays, ‖ Diodorus *his Diſciple* (Auditor) *carry'd the Notion farther, and thought beſides Vertue, there ſhou'd be freedom from all Pain.* In another place, he has put *Auditor* and *Diſcipulus* together, and plainly means the ſame thing by 'em. † *Heraclides Ponticus*, ſays he, *a learned Man, Hearer and Diſciple of* Plato, *writes, that the Mother of* Phalaris *dream'd ſhe ſaw the Images of the Gods*, &c.

It ſufficiently appears then from hence, that μαθητὴς, or a Diſciple, does undoubtedly mean a Hearer or Learner; and ſo to *make Diſciples* muſt imply to teach 'em, or to make them Hearers, *viz.* by reading Lectures, and inſtructing 'em, or the like.

Perhaps it mayn't be amiſs to obſerve here, how well this agrees with ſome Words of *Cicero*, concerning *Dion* the *Sicilian*, of whom, as we noted before, *Plutarch* ſays, that he was very deſirous to hear (ἀκοῦσαι) or be inſtructed by *Plato*. As *Cornel. Nepos* alſo expreſſes it, * *He was extremely deſirous* (audiendi) *of hearing him.* But *Cicero*, in one place, calls him *Plato*'s Diſciple: (*a*) Dion *who was of* Plato's *School, when his Son was kill'd by a fall from the top of a Houſe, not only gave*

‖ *De Finib. Bon. & Mal. lib.* 5. *cap.* 5. Diodorus, ejus Auditor, adjungit ad Honeſtatem, Vacuitatem Doloris.

† *De Divinatione, lib.* 1. *cap.* 23. Matrem Phalaridis ſcribit Ponticus Heraclides, doctus Vir, Auditor, & Diſcipulus Platonis, viſam eſſe videre in Somniis Simulacra Deorum, *&c.*

* *Vit.* 10. *Dion. cap.* 2. *pag.* 98, 99. Dion ejus audiendi Cupiditate flagraret.

(*a*) *De Conſol. p.* 567. *a.* Dion certè, qui è Platonis Schola defluxit, cum ejus Filius in Atrium è tecto delapſum interiſſet, non modo non doluit, ſed etiam in eo, quod tum fortè agebat, conſtanter perſtitit: quo Facto judicavit & Vir Sapiens & Platonis Diſcipulus, quid Cæteros, qui Sapientes haberi volunt, facere oporteat.

no signs of Grief, but calmly went on with what he happen'd to be doing at the time, without any Commotion: by which this great Man, and Disciple of Plato *shew'd, how others, who wou'd be thought wise, shou'd behave themselves.* In another place, speaking of the same Person, he says, † *Who was it that enrich'd* Dion *of* Syracuse *with all kind of Learning? Was it not* Plato? *&c. Did* Plato *instruct* Dion *in any other Arts?* &c. In the former Passage, he calls *Dion Plato's* Disciple; and in the latter, he explains what he meant by it, and says, he was instructed by *Plato*: as if both Expressions amounted to one and the same thing; and that to call any one *Plato's* Disciple, was just the same as to say, he was taught by *Plato.*

Thus *Lucian* also, who perhaps understood the Propriety of the *Greek* as well as any Man, has expounded it. *Anacharsis* was come from *Scythia* to *Greece* to learn of *Solon*, &c. the Wisdom and Manners of the *Grecians*, and the Art of Government, as he himself says: and *Lucian* introduces him saying to *Solon*, ‖ *You can't be more willing to teach* (διδάσκων) *me, and make me your Disciple,* (μαθητὴν ποιέμενος) *than I shall be, with pleasure, to hear you discourse of Laws and Government.* Here it is necessarily imported, that to make a Disciple, is to teach; and that it is the Office of a Disciple or Scholar, to hear and learn. And therefore too we sometimes find Μαθητὴς and διδάσκαλος, a *Teacher* or *Master*, us'd as Correlates; and as such, oppos'd to each other: So

† *De Oratore lib.* 3. *p.* 131. *a.* Quis Dionem Syracusium Doctrinis omnibus expolivit? non Plato? *&c.* Aliisne igitur Artibus hunc Dionem instituit Plato, *&c.*

‖ De Gymnas. pag. 276. Ὥστε ἂν ἄν φθάνοις διδάσκων με, καὶ Μαθητὴν ποιέμενος, ὡς ἔγωγε ἥδεως ——— ἐπακούοιμι περὶ Πολιτείας τε, καὶ νόμων διεξιόντος.

Themi-

Themiſtius, in a Speech to the Senate, ſays, ‖ *Tho I am not capable of ſaying any thing worthy of this Audience, but what I have before learn'd from you; yet I have ſtrangely ventur'd to take upon me the part of a Maſter, inſtead of that of a Diſciple.* Evidently importing, that μαθητὴς is a Learner or a Hearer, Ἀκροατὴς, as the ſame Author elſewhere * expreſſes it. *Cicero* likewiſe uſing the ſame kind of Oppoſition, ſays, Panætius † *the Maſter or Teacher* (Doctor) *of* Poſidonius, *but the Scholar or Diſciple* (Diſcipulus) *of* Antipater, *degenerated indeed from the Stoicks, or the chief Men of that Sect* ——

Now the Terms of a Relation, according to the Logicians, you know, Sir, mutually imply and *relate* to each other: and therefore as Maſter implys a Scholar to whom he is Maſter, ſo Scholar implys a Maſter to whom he is Scholar: and the ground of theſe Relations is Teaching in the Maſter, and Learning in the Scholar; which therefore either Term of the Relation does always neceſſarily import.

By this time I have certainly carry'd it beyond all poſſibility of doubting, that μαθητὴς and μαθητεύω do ever include teaching in their Signification. And to all I have ſtill this to add, that notwithſtanding ſome of the Pædobaptiſts generally build ſo much upon this common Criticiſm, and think their Cauſe ſufficiently ſecur'd by it, the moſt judicious and learned Men have always aſſerted, that the Word does (at leaſt in the Commiſſion) ſignify to *teach*

‖ Orat. 13. pag. 298. Ὥστε κἀγὼ νῦν, ἀδὲν ἄλλο εἰπὼν δεξιὸν ἢ ἃ παρ' ὑμῶν ἔμαθον ῥήματα ἀντὶ μαθητοῦ ἀμφισβητῶ διδάσκαλος εἶναι.

* Orat. 2. p. 53.

† *De Divinatione*, *lib.* 1. *c.* 3. Sed a Stoicis, vel principibus ejus Diſciplinæ, Poſidonii Doctor, Diſcipulus Antipatri, degeneravit Panætius, *&c.*

and

and *inſtruct*. I don't deſire you ſhou'd take this on my Word, and therefore I'll produce ſome Inſtances of it; for in matters of this nature I truſt no body my ſelf, nor wou'd have any body truſt me.

I need not repeat what I have before noted from the Biſhop of *Salisbury* (*a*), and Dr. *Whitby* (*b*), nor how much even Dr. *Hammond* has been ſhewn (*c*) to acknowledg the true Meaning of the Word: but I will go on to obſerve, that *Conſtantine*, tho he thinks the Word ſometimes means *to be*, or *to make Diſciples*; yet he ſays, that it ſignifys (*d*) *doceo*, διδασκω, *to teach*, as the primary and more genuine Senſe; and for this he cites the Commiſſion, *Matth.* xxviii. 19. as a plain undoubted Inſtance: and ſo before him does (*e*) *Henry Stephens*; for when he ſays the Word ſignifys *doceo* to *teach*, without any Heſitation he confirms it by this Commiſſion, as ſuppoſing it to be an unexceptionable Inſtance to that purpoſe. And (*f*) *Leigh* from theſe, does juſt the ſame thing.

That profound *Calviniſt* Divine, Monſieur *Turretine*, ſays, Infants (*g*) *are no more capable of actual Faith, than they are of that Inſtruction with which the Adult are to be taught, and made Diſciples of* CHRIST, *Matth.* xxviii. 19. And in another place, he ſays, (*h*) CHRIST *ſending his Apoſtles to gather a Church, ſuppoſes the Neceſſity of a prece-*

(*a*) Supra p. 260. (*b*) Supra p. 261. (*c*) Supra p. 259, 260, 292.
(*d*) Lexic. ad Voc. (*e*) Theſaur. ad Voc.
(*f*) Critica Sacra ad Voc. in Margin.
(*g*) *Inſtitut. Theolog. Par.* II. *pag.* 640. §. 9. Cujus non magis capaces ſunt, quam illius Inſtitutionis, quâ docentur Adulti, & Diſcipuli CHRISTI fiunt, Mat. xxviii. 19.
(*h*) *Ibid. Par.* III. *p.* 3. §. 8. CHRISTUS mittens Apoſtolos ad Eccleſiæ Collectionem, ſupponit Neceſſitatem Inſtitu-

precedaneous Inſtruction, and Knowledg of his Doctrines; Matth. xxviii. 19. *Go teach all Nations, baptizing them.* And ſo he goes on, by other Paſſages likewiſe, to confirm this Method of making Church-Members. I know this ſame Gentleman, treating of Infant-Baptiſm in another place, * denys again that the Word means *to teach*; but how theſe Contradictions can be reconcil'd, let the Reader judg: thoſe who will give themſelves the Liberty to think, will doubtleſs ſee it cou'd be nothing but the Prejudice of Education that made him deny what he had at leaſt twice before aſſerted in the ſame Syſtem.

Epiſcopius, the judicious Remonſtrant, eſtabliſhing the divine Authority of Water-Baptiſm, has, among the reſt, this remarkable Paſſage to our purpoſe: † *Perhaps you will object, that* μαθητεύειν *does not ſignify properly to teach, but to make Diſciples. Be it ſo; yet they cou'd not make Diſciples, but by teaching them, and by teaching 'em thoſe things which belong'd to the Chriſtian Religion: for Diſciple and Doctor, or Teacher, are Relatives. Therefore St.* Mark xvi. 15. *does not uſe* μαθητεύειν, *but* κηρύττειν, i. e. *to preach or teach. Beſides,* μαθητεύειν, *or the Hebrew* תלמד *does not in this place ſignify barely*

---

tionis & Cognitionis Doctrinæ præcedaneæ, *Matth.* xxviii. *Ite, docete omnes.*

* Inſtitut. Theolog. Part III. *p.* 464. §. 4.

† *Reſponſ. ad Quæſt.* 37. *pag.* 35, 36. Dices; μαθητεύειν non ſignificat propriè docere, ſed Diſcipulos facere. Eſto inquam. At Diſcipulos facere non poterant niſi docerent, & quatenus docerent ea, quæ ad Religionem CHRISTI pertinebant. Diſcipulus enim & Doctor ſunt Relata: unde Marcus *cap.* 16 15. non utitur Verbo μαθητεύειν ſed Verbo κηρύττειν, id eſt prædicare, ſive docere. Deinde μαθητεύειν ſive Hebræum תלמד non ſignificat hoc loco ſimpliciter docere tantum, ſed docere ita ut Diſcipulos ſive תלמידים conſequaris, *&c.*

to

to teach, but to teach so as to gain Disciples תלמידים, *&c.*

Mr. *Limborch* answering the same Objection with *Episcopius*, and with the same Design, says, * 1. *They cou'd not make Disciples but by teaching.* 2. *By this Instruction the Disciples were brought over to the Faith before they were baptiz'd*, Mark xvi. 15, 16. And again elsewhere he says, † *Hence also our* LORD *commanded, that Men shou'd first be taught, and brought over to the Faith, and after that be baptiz'd*, Matth. xxviii. 19. Mark xvi. 15, 16.

Cameron on the place, says, || μαθητεύειν *signifys simply* διδάσκειν, *to teach; but here to teach what relates to Religion.* The famous *Martin Bucer* allows the Sense which the Antipædobaptists contend for, and does not in the least attempt to evade it; for to the Argument which we draw from the Commission, he only says, (a) *The Anabaptists think they argue very strongly against Infant-Baptism from this Place. But I have answer'd their Objection above*, Chap. 3. *And till they can find a Place where they are commanded to baptize none but those that are taught, this Text will be of no Advantage to their Opinion.* So that *Bucer* acknowledges here the

---

* *Institut. lib.* 5. *cap.* 67. §. 7. 1. Non poterant Discipulos facere, nisi docendo. 2. Per Institutionem illam Discipuli ad Fidem adducebantur, antequam baptizarentur, Marc. xvi. 15, 16.

† *Ibid. cap.* 68. *Sect.* 2. Hinc & DOMINUS prius Homines doceri & ad Fidem suam perduci, dein baptizari jubet, Matth. xxviii. 19. Marc. xvi. 15, 16.

|| Quin simpliciter μαθητεύειν est διδάσκειν docere, sed docere ea quæ pertinent ad Religionem.

(a) *Enarrat. in* 4. *Evangel. in loc. p.* 204. Anabaptistæ Infantium Baptismum fortissime oppugnare sibi videntur. Sed his responsum supra est *Cap.* 3. Sane dum non habent Locum, quo præcipitur, tantum Doctos baptizare, nihil roboris suæ sententiæ hinc adferent.

Word does mean to *teach*; and fancys Infant-Baptiſm cannot hence be prov'd unlawful, for no other reaſon, but becauſe it is not ſaid expreſly, *baptize ſuch only as are taught.* But how weak and trifling this is, every one that reads it muſt ſee. He refers indeed to *Chap.* 3. for a fuller Anſwer; but all he ſays there is, that the Commiſſion ſpeaks only of Adult Perſons, and that 'tis no wonder therefore it ſhou'd put teaching before baptizing.

Rigaltius argues profeſſedly from this Senſe of the Words, in his Note on St. *Cyprian*'s 64th Epiſtle. The Paſſage is worth reading, but too large to be here tranſcrib'd, and therefore I can give you but a taſte of it: * *This may be gather'd,* ſays he, *from what has been ſaid above, where the Words of our* LORD *are exceeding clear, who commands to teach, before they baptize.*

Eraſmus in his Annotation on *Matth.* xxvii. 57. cites the Commiſſion as an Inſtance in which the Word is us'd tranſitively, and ſignifys to *teach*; and accordingly tranſlates it *docete, teach* all Nations. And in his Paraphraſe on the Words, he takes it altogether in that Senſe.

The incomparable *Grotius* explains the *Greek* Word by a Paſſage he quotes † from the *Conſtitutions* aſcrib'd to St. *Clement*, without naming the Place indeed, but you may find the Words exactly as he has tranſcrib'd 'em, *lib.* 7. *cap.* 40. *All Ungodlineſs and Impiety,* ſays he, *muſt be firſt remov'd,*

---

* *Cyprian. pag.* 280. Not. a. Hoc neceſſario colligi videtur ex antedictis, ubi apertiſſima ſunt Verba DOMINI, jubentis docere, priuſquam tingere.

† In Loc. Senſum explicat Scriptor Conſtitutionum quæ Clementi adſcribuntur, Δεῖ ὑμᾶς πρότερον πᾶσαν Ἀσέβειαν ἐξελόντας ἀπ' αὐτῶν, τότε τὴν Εὐσέβειαν αὐτοῖς ἐγχειρίζεσθαι, καὶ τὸ Βαπτίσμα ἀξιῶσαι.

and

and the contrary Principles of true Holiness introduc'd, and so they must be baptiz'd. In the Annotation on the Verse following the Commission, concerning which the Dispute is, he remarks, that there are two sorts of teaching; the one more imperfect, by way of Initiation into the first Principles; the other more complete, by a fuller and more accurate Instruction: and * *the former*, says he, *seems to be the Import of the Word* μαθητεύειν: *for it means to initiate as it were into the Doctrines, and this is to precede Baptism; the fuller Instruction is signify'd by* διδάσκειν, *and is here plac'd after Baptism.*

To these I will add but one Authority more, namely, that of *Lucas Brugensis*, who in his Note on Verse 19. says, † *he commands them to teach.* And afterwards, in the Note on Verse 20. he has these Words: ‖ διδάσκοντες] *The Evangelist*, says he, *uses another Word in the Verse above, where we read* μαθητεύσατε: *The difference between 'em seems to be this, that* μαθητεύειν *signifys to teach those who are yet utter Strangers to the Doctrine, and not under your Tutorage, so as to make 'em Disciples; but* διδάσκειν *means to teach such as are already become Disciples, and give themselves up to your Instructions.*

And

---

* *Grot. in Matth.* xxviii. 20. Cum duplex sit docendi Ratio, alia per Modum Εἰσαγωγῆς ἢ Στοιχειωσέων, alia per Modum Διδασκαλίας, prior suprà videtur indicari Verbo μαθητεύειν, id enim est veluti *in Disciplinam initiare*, & Baptismo præponitur: posterior Verbo διδάσκειν, quod hic post Baptismum locatur.

† In 4. Evangel. Jubet eos docere.

‖ Διδάσκοντες] Alia est Vox Græca Versu superiori, ubi legitur ——— μαθητεύσατε: Discrimen hoc esse videtur, quod μαθητεύειν sit, docere eos qui à Doctrina & Magisterio tuo sunt alieni, ita ut reddas Discipulos: διδάσκειν vero, docere jam Discipulos redditos, & Magisterio tuo addictos tanquam Præceptorem: quod Discrimen Loco optime congruit.

And this difference ſutes very well with the Place: for CHRIST *commanded firſt to teach the Nations which are Strangers to* GOD *and the Truth; and afterwards, when they have ſubmitted themſelves to the Truth, to teach 'em thoſe Precepts and Rules of Life which are worthy* GOD *and the Truth they profeſs.* The Order here obſerv'd, ſays St. *Hierom*, is excellent: He commands the Apoſtles, firſt to teach all Nations; and after that, to dip them with the Sacrament of Faith; and then to ſhew 'em how they muſt behave themſelves after their Faith and Baptiſm. *Before Baptiſm, they are to be taught the Truth of the Goſpel, eſpecially matters of Faith; but after Baptiſm, they are to be inſtructed in the Chriſtian Morals, and what concerns their Practice.*

'Twou'd be eaſy to bring ſeveral other Authoritys; but theſe I think ſufficient to ſhew that ſome of the beſt Judges acknowledg my Senſe of the Word. And now, in the next place:

2. I am to confirm this to be the Meaning of it in the Commiſſion, by the ſeveral Verſions which have been made: for of all I have yet ſeen, and am capable of finding the Senſe of, not one renders it otherwiſe. Mr. *Wall*, on this very Occaſion, takes the liberty poſitively to aſſert, that St. *Matthew* wrote his Goſpel in *Hebrew*; tho it has been ſhewn to be very improbable (or at leaſt exceeding doubtful) by Men of great Repu-

---

gruit. Jubet enim JESUS, priùs ut Gentes a DEO ac Veritate alienæ Veritatem doceantur: deinde poſtquam Veritati colla ſubdiderint, doceantur Præcepta Vitæ DEO ac Veritate dignæ *Ordo eſt pulcherrimus*, inquit Hieronymus, *Juſſit Apoſtolos, ut primum docerent Univerſas Gentes, deinde, Fidei intingerent Sacramento, & poſt Fidem ac Baptiſma quæ eſſent obſervanda præciperent.* Ante Baptiſmum docenda eſt Veritas Evangelica, docenda ſunt ea potiſſimum quæ ſunt Fidei, poſt Baptiſmum ea quæ ſunt Morum.

tation,

tation, and therefore is a Notion not fit to ground an Argument upon. All the Use he makes of this Remark, is to insinuate, that probably the Word which St. *Matthew* originally us'd, might better bear to be render'd, and more properly signify only to *proselyte* or *enter as a Disciple*, without implying to *teach*, as the *Greek* Word by which it's translated does. His Words are these: * *The common Language of the* Jews, *(in which Language it was that St.* Matthew *wrote this Gospel) as it does not admit of this Phrase*, an Infant is taught *or* instructed; *so it very well allows of this other*, such or such an Infant is enter'd a Disciple, *or* made a Proselyte *to such a Profession or Religion.*

Tho 'tis very doubtful at least whether St. *Matthew* wrote in *Hebrew* or not, yet supposing he did, our Adversarys can have no Help from thence at all: For,

1. 'Tis very likely, the antient Translator of that Gospel into *Greek*, whoever he was, (some think 'twas St. *Matthew* himself) understood the Force of the original Word at least as well as our Author can do, who does not know what the Word was. But,

2. We can't guess what Word was us'd in the suppos'd *Hebrew* Original, better than from the *Hebrew* and other Oriental Versions which are now extant; and these make strongly against Mr. *Wall.* The *Hebrew* Copy printed at *Paris* 1584. reads תלמרו; and that publish'd by *Hutterus* reads למרו from למד, whose Signification no Man questions to be *didicit*, *docuit*, *he learn'd*, *he taught*, or the like. In *Kal* it signifys learn, *Jerem.* x. 2. in *Pihel teach*, as *Psalm* 94. 12. The *Syriack* Version likewise reads it ܠܡܰܕ̰ܘ,

* Part II. pag. 378.

exactly in the ſame Senſe, and from the ſame Root ﻉﻠﻤ *erudivit, he taught* or *inſtructed*. The *Arabian* Tranſlator uſing juſt the ſame Word, reads ﻳﻌﻠﻤﻮﺍ which ſignifys properly to teach, as *Acts* xix. 20. *Matth.* xiii. 52. The *Perſick* indeed I know nothing of; but Mr. *Sam. Clerk* of *Merton*-College *Oxon*, in the *Polyglot*, tranſlates the Place *docete, teach*; and therefore 'tis to be preſum'd that Verſion alſo favours our Cauſe as much as the others undoubtedly to do. The *Ethiopick* is moſt expreſs; for I don't know that ⳐⲨⲰ is ever once us'd to ſignify any thing elſe but *teach, learn*, &c. *Wemmers* in his *Lexicon*, and *Ludolfus* after him, and *Caſtellus*, render it by *teach*, but never give the leaſt Intimation that it is any where us'd in a Senſe which can favour our Adverſarys; and I think I may be poſitive, no Man can produce an Inſtance from the Scriptures where it does not mean properly to *teach, learn*, &c. except only from the Old Teſtament, where indeed it ſometimes ſignifys to *prey* or *plunder*; a Senſe which can do our Antagoniſts no Service: but the *Lexicons* furniſh us with Inſtances enough of its proper Senſe; to which might be added *Matth.* xi. 1. and 1 *Cor.* xv. 2, 3. *Gal.* i. 8, 9. and to the beſt of my knowledg, all other places where the Word occurs, at leaſt in the New Teſtament. It may be farther noted, that this *Ethiopick* Word bears conſiderable Affinity in Senſe, and is the ſame in Orthography with the *Arabick* ﻋﻠﻢ which is render'd *peritus fuit, he was skill'd* or *learn'd*, in the Catalogue drawn up by the admirable *Bochart*, and afterwards enlarg'd by *Ludolfus*, to ſhew the Agreement of the *Ethiopick* with other Eaſtern Languages.

Hence

Hence it's plain, all the Oriental Versions we know of, understand and render the Commission so, as to make μαθητεύσατε signify to *teach*. To these we may add *Arias Montanus*, the *Vulgar Latin*, and that corrected by command of *Sixtus* V. *Beza*'s Version, and that of *Erasmus*, which render it by *docete*, and *Castalio*'s, which has it *doctum*, *teach*. The old *Italian* Version reads *insegnate* to *teach*; and *Diodati* renders it *ammaestrate*, in the same Sense. A *Spanish* Edition at hand, has *ensennad*; the *French* printed at *Lyons*, renders the Word by *enseigner*; and that which was made by the Gentlemen of *Geneva*, by *instruiser*, all signifying properly and literally to *teach*: as likewise do the *Dutch* Version, which reads *leert*, the *Danish* Lærer, and the *Saxon* Edition publish'd by *Junius* læpað. And the late Version into the Vulgar or Modern *Greek*, made for the use of the *Greek* Church, renders it διδάξετε, the same Word which in *Matth.* xxviii. 20. (the Verse next to that which has the Word in dispute) our Adversarys say, signifys literally and properly to teach. And I think all our *English* Translations likewise do constantly render the Commission, *teach* all Nations, *&c.* which must appear to be the true Sense of the Place: for the admirable and exact Agreement of so many, and perhaps all, Translations; and the Judgment of so many learned Gentlemen employ'd in making 'em, is very considerable, and will certainly be allow'd a great Argument in the Case, strongly to confirm our Sense, as expres's'd in the common *English* Version, to be the true, and the most conformable to the Original.

3. In the 3d Place I am to shew you that the Fathers of the Primitive Church also understood the Words in the same Sense. *Clemens Alexandrinus*

drinus reads the Place thus: * *Go about and preach* (κηρύσσετε) *and ſuch as ſhall believe, baptize in the Name of the* FATHER, *and of the* SON, *and of the* HOLY GHOST. So *Origen* likewiſe takes it in this Paſſage: † *The Apoſtles therefore left* Iſrael, *and obey'd our* SAVIOUR's *Command,* Teach all Nations; *and,* you ſhall be unto me Witneſſes both in *Jeruſalem,* and in all *Judea,* &c. *They did therefore as they were commanded in* Jeruſalem *and* Judea; *but when the* Jews *rejected the Word, for a Prophet has no Honour in his own Country, then they turn'd to the* Gentiles. It's plain *Origen* ſpeaks of the Apoſtles Preaching, and cites the Words in diſpute, *Matth.* xxviii. 19. as the Commiſſion CHRIST gave 'em to do ſo. Again, mentioning the Completion of ſeveral of our LORD's Prophecys, among the reſt he places this: ‖ *We every day,* ſays he, *ſee the fulfilling of thoſe things our* LORD *long ſince foretold, as that the Goſpel ſhall be preach'd in all the World, and that the Diſciples going forth ſhou'd preach the Word to all Nations,* &c. In another Place he takes notice of the Wiſdom of Divine Providence in facilitating the Work of the Apoſtles, by bringing ſo great a Part of the World

---

* Epitom. pag. 800. a. Πορευθέντες κηρύξατε, καὶ τοῖς πιστεύουσι βαπτίζεσθε εἰς ὄνομα ΠΑΤΡΟΣ, καὶ ΥΙΟΥ, καὶ ΑΓΙΟΥ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ

† Comment. in Matth. pag. 225. Καὶ οἱ Ἀπόστολοι διὰ τοῦτο καθέλιπον τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, ἐποίησαν δὲ τὸ προστεταγμένον ὑπὸ τοῦ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ Ἔθνη, καὶ τί· ἔσεσθέ μοι Μάρτυρες ἔντε Ἱερουσαλὴμ, καὶ πάσῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ, καὶ Σαμαρείᾳ, &c. πεποιήκασι μὲν ἃ ἦν τὸ προστεταγμένον ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ, καὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ. ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ Προφήτης ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ Πατρίδι πωλοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, μὴ παραδεξαμένων Ἰουδαίων τὸν Λόγον, ἀπεληλύθασιν εἰς τὰ Ἔθνη.

‖ Contra Celſum, Lib. 2. pag. 84. Καὶ ἀεὶ ὁρῶντες πληρούμενα τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πρὸ γένηται. τὸ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦτο ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ Κόσμῳ καὶ προδοθέντας αὐτοῦ τοῖς Μαθηταῖς εἰς πάντα τὰ Ἔθνη τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ καταγγελκέναι.

under

under the *Roman* Emperour's Jurisdiction, * *that it might not be render'd*, says he, *too difficult for the Apostles to execute the Commands their* LORD *had given 'em to* go and teach all Nations. *'Tis certain that* JESUS *was born in the Reign of* Augustus, *a Prince, who as it were prepar'd the way for him, by reducing so many Kingdoms into one. For had all different States remain'd distinct, under separate independant Governours, it might have been a considerable Obstruction to the spreading of the Doctrine of* JESUS *thro all the World.* 'Tis plain that *Origen* in this Passage cites and understands the Commission in dispute, only in the Sense we contend for; *Teach all Nations*, being explain'd in the last Clause by *spreading the Doctrine of* JESUS *thro all the World.*

The *Exposition of Faith* attributed to St. *Justin* has this Passage: † *Our* LORD JESUS CHRIST, *being about to return into Heaven after his Resurrection from the dead, gives his Apostles a charge concerning teaching the Nations, and the Doctrine of Baptism, in these Words*; Go teach, *&c.* And the same Father, in his Treatise entitled, *A Dialogue with* Trypho *the* Jew, speaking of teaching and converting the Nations, and alluding to the Commission, *Matt.* xxviii. 19. says,

---

* Contra Celsum, Lib. 2. pag. 79. Ἵνα μὴ χαλεπώτερον γένηται τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις τοῦ ΙΗΣΟΥ τὸ ποιῆσαι ὅπερ προσέταξεν αὐτοῖς ὁ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ, εἰπών· Πορευθέντες, μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ Ἔθνη. καὶ σαφέστερον, ὅτι χρὴ τὴν Αὐγούστου Βασιλείαν, ὁ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ γεγεννῆσθαι, τοῦτ' (ἵν' ἔτως ὀνομάσω) ὁμαλίσαντος διὰ μιᾶς Βασιλείας τοὺς πολλοὺς τοῦ ὅπη γῆς. ἵνα δ' ἂν ἐμπόδιον τοῦ νεμηθῆναι τὴν ΙΗΣΟΥ Διδασκαλίαν εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην τὸ, πολλὰς εἶναι Βασιλείας, &c.

† Expos. Fidei, pag. 376. Ὁ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ἡμῶν ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ, μέλλων τὴν ἐκ Νεκρῶν Ἀνάστασιν, τὴν ἐν Οὐρανοῖς Ἄνοδον ποιεῖσθαι μέλλων, καὶ τὴν τοῦ Ἐθνῶν Μαθητείαν, καὶ τὴν τοῦ Βαπτίσματος Διδαχὴν τοὺς Ἀποστόλους παιδεύσας λέγων, πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε, &c.

When

‖ *When* CHRIST *came and ſent forth his Diſciples, he inſtructed* (ἐμαθήτευσεν) *or taught them*, i. e. the Nations.

Euſebius ſays, the Apoſtles went out and preach'd to the Nations * *with the Power and Authority of* CHRIST, *who had ſaid unto 'em, Go teach all Nations in my Name.* By which it's plain he underſtood theſe Words meant, to preach the Goſpel.

The *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, which are of conſiderable Antiquity, tho not ſo antient as 'tis pretended, may ſerve to ſhew us likewiſe that the more impartial Antients of the Time in which they were compos'd, if we ſhou'd allow 'em to be Pædobaptiſts, act more ingenuouſly than ſome Moderns, and confeſs the Words in diſpute are to be underſtood in the Anti-pædobaptiſts Senſe, as appears beyond contradiction from theſe Words: † *All Ungodlineſs and Impiety muſt be firſt remov'd, and the contrary Principles of true Holineſs introduc'd, and ſo they muſt be baptiz'd. For our* LORD *commanded, ſaying*, Teach *firſt* all Nations: *and after that he adds*, And baptize 'em in the Name, &c. Whoever is the Author of the Homilys aſcrib'd to St. *Clement*, (perhaps 'tis the Interpolator)

‖ Pag. 272. ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ὅτ☉ ἐλθὼν, διὰ τ῀ Μαθητ῀ Αὐτ῀, πέμψας ἐμαθήτευσεν ἀυ῀ς.

* Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. 3. cap. 5. Ἐπὶ δὲ τ῀ τ῀ Κηρύγμα☉ Διδασκαλίᾳ τ῀ω εἰς σύμπαντα τὰ Ἔθνη σειλαμβάνων Προφάσει σὺν Δυνάμει τ῀ ΧΡΙΣΤΟ῀ φήσαντ☉ αὐτοῖς πορεθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ Ἔθνη ἐν τ῀ Ὀνόματί μ, &c.

† Lib. 7. cap. 40. Οὕτω δεῖ κὴ ὑμᾶς πρότερον πᾶσαν Ἀσέβειαν ἐξελόντας ἀπ' ἀυτ῀, τότε τ῀ω Εὐσέβειαν ἀυτῆς ἐγκαταβάλλεσθαι, κὴ τ῀ Βαπτίσματ☉ ἀξιῶσαι. κὴ γὸ κὴ ὁ ΚΥ῀ΡΙΟΣ ὑμῶν ὅτως ἡμῖν παρήνεσεν, εἰπὼν· μαθητεύσατε πρότερον πάντα τὰ Ἔθνη· κὴ τότε ἐπήγαγε, τὸ· κὴ βαπτίσατε ἀυτὰς εἰς τὸ Ὄνομα τ῀ ΠΑΤΡΟ῀Σ κὴ τ῀ ΥΙΟ῀Υ, κὴ τ῀ ΑΓΙ῀ΟΥ ΠΝΕΥ῀ΜΑΤΟΣ.

says

ſays exactly the ſame thing in theſe Words, which are ſuppos'd to be ſpoken by St. *Peter*; ‖ *When our* LORD *ſent us to the ignorant* Gentiles, *to baptize 'em for the Remiſſion of Sins, he commanded us firſt to teach 'em.*

Epiphanius too paraphraſes the Words thus: * *Teach all Nations, that is, convert and turn the Nations from their Corruptions to the Truth.* And to the ſame purpoſe St. *Baſil* ſays, as he is tranſlated by Mr. *Wall* himſelf, † *They muſt be firſt inſtructed, and then admitted to Baptiſm.* This Author indeed ſpeaks more fully here to this effect, than Mr. *Wall* has cited him.

The Senſe of the *Latin* Fathers in this Caſe is evidently the ſame, from their tranſlating the Place conſtantly, *docete, teach. Tertullian* in his Treatiſe of Baptiſm reads the Words, *Go teach* (docete) *the Nations*, &c. To this he adds *John* iii. 5. Except a Man be born again of Water and the SPIRIT, *&c.* And from both concludes, that ‖ *Faith and the Neceſſity of Baptiſm are very cloſely join'd together; therefore all who believ'd were baptiz'd. So St.* Paul *when he believ'd was baptiz'd.* And a little after he ſays, * *Firſt they were to preach, and after that to baptize.* In another Place, on occa-

‖ Clementin. Hom. 17. cap. 7. Εἰς τὰ ἀμαθῆ Ἔθνη ἀποστέλλων ἡμᾶς, βαπτίζειν αὐτοὺς εἰς Ἄφεσιν Ἁμαρτιῶν, ἐνετείλατο ἡμῖν πρότερον διδάξαι αὐτούς.

† Epiphan. adverſ. Hæreſ. Lib. 1. pag. 50. Μαθητεύσατε τὰ Ἔθνη, τυτέστι, μεταβάλλεσθε τὰ Ἔθνη ἀπὸ κακίας εἰς Ἀλήθειαν.

† De Baptiſmo, l. 1. c. 2. p. 643. D. Δεῖ πρῶτον μαθητευθῆναι τῷ ΚΥΡΙΩ, καὶ τότε καταξιωθῆναι τοῦ ἁγίου Βαπτίσματος.

‖ Cap. 13. Ite, inquit, docete Nationes, tinguentes eas, &c. Huic Legi collata Definitio illa: Niſi quis renatus fuerit, &c. obſtrinxit fidem ad Baptiſmi neceſſitatem. Itaque omnes exinde credentes tinguebantur. Tunc & Paulus ubi credidit, tinctus eſt.

* Cap. 14. Nam & prius eſt prædicare, poſterius tinguere.

ſion

ſion of this Commiſſion he ſays, * *The Apoſtles were appointed Doctors or Teachers of the Nations.* But nothing can be more clear than the following Words of the ſame Father: When our LORD † *was going to his* FATHER *after his Reſurrection, he commanded the Eleven to go and teach* (docere) *the Nations, which were to be baptiz'd in the Name,* &c. *The Apoſtles therefore (who, as their Name ſignifys, were ſent) having by the Authority of the Prophecy in the Pſalms elected* Matthias *by Lot for a Twelfth in* Judas's *room, and receiv'd the promis'd Power of the* HOLY SPIRIT, *to enable 'em to work Miracles, and ſpeak with Tongues; firſt preach'd Faith in* CHRIST, *then conſtituted Churches in* Judea; *and afterwards went out into all the World, and publiſh'd the ſame Faith among the Nations,* &c.

The Confeſſor *Clarus*, Biſhop of *Maſcula* in *Numidia*, referring to the Commiſſion, *Mat.* xxviii. 19. ſays, they after the Apoſtles ‖ *baptiz'd the Faith of Believers*; that is, they baptiz'd according to the Commiſſion and Practice of the Apoſtles, ſuch as believ'd, upon the Profeſſion of their Faith.

To theſe I will only add St. *Hierom*, and I have done with this Head. He, commenting

---

* Præſcript. Hæretic. cap. 8. Nationibus deſtinati Doctores Apoſtoli, &c.

† Tertull. de Præſcript. Hæretic. cap. 20. Undecim digrediens ad PATREM poſt Reſurrectionem, juſſit ire & docere Nationes, intinguendas in PATREM, &c. Statim igitur Apoſtoli (quos hæc Appellatio Miſſos interpretatur) aſſumpto per ſortem duodecimo *Matthia* in locum *Judæ*, ex Auctoritate Prophetiæ, quæ eſt in Pſalmo *David*, conſecuti promiſſam vim SPIRITUS SANCTI ad Virtutes & Eloquium, primo per Judeam conteſtata fide in JESUM CHRISTUM, & Eccleſiis inſtitutis, dehinc in Orbem profecti, eandem Doctrinam ejuſdem Fidei nationibus promulgaverunt, &c.

‖ Cyprian. de Concil. Carthag. Suffrag. 79. Credentium Fidem baptizantes.

on

on the Words of the Commission, says, † *The Order here observ'd is excellent: for he commands the Apostles, first to teach all Nations, and after that to dip them with the Sacrament of Faith; and then to shew 'em how they must behave themselves after their Faith and Baptism.* And Mr. *Wall* has transcrib'd Words to the same effect from this Place of St. *Hierom*, which he thus translates: ‖ *They first teach all the Nations, then when they are taught they baptize 'em with Water; for it can't be that the Body shou'd receive the Sacrament of Baptism, unless the Soul have before receiv'd the true Faith.* This Passage, it seems, had been made use of against Pædobaptism: and Mr. *Wall* undertakes to answer the Argument rais'd from it, by insinuating that the Commission, and the Comment of St. *Jerom*, relate only to Adult Persons. But this is so far from lessening, that it rather adds to its strength; for if this Commission does not relate to Infant-Baptism, and therefore not authorize it, the Dispute's at an end, unless they can shew us some other that does command it; which all Men know cannot be done.

4. Having prov'd our Sense to be the same in which the Fathers of the Primitive Church always understood the Commission; I am now in the last Place to confirm it to be the true, by what is infinitely of more weight than any thing urg'd before, I mean, by the Authority of the Sacred Scriptures themselves.

---

† In Matth. xxviii. 19. Ordo præcipuus, jussit Apostolos ut primum docerent universas gentes, deinde fidei intingerent Sacramento, & post fidem ac Baptisma quæ essent observanda præciperent.

‖ Ibid. Primum docent omnes gentes, deinde doctas intingunt aqua: Non enim potest fieri ut corpus recipiat Baptismi Sacramentum, nisi ante anima Fidei susceperit veritatem.

And

And here we might largely consider the History of the Practice of the Apostles in this matter, for they undoubtedly acted in perfect Conformity to the Directions and Will of their Great MASTER, and therefore their Practice is justly accounted the best Comment upon our SAVIOUR's Words and Institutions. Now they, 'tis plain, (if the Scriptures give us a good Account of the Matter) constantly taught first and baptiz'd afterwards; at least, 'tis on all hands allow'd, they took this method with the *Gentiles*, to whom they were sent by this Commission: by which 'tis evident how they to whom it was immediately given understood it, and that they thought it oblig'd 'em to proceed in that manner. And this precedaneous Teaching and Faith were necessary, not only to render the Persons *willing* to be baptiz'd, as some fancy, but likewise *fit* to receive the Salutary Grace; and therefore St. *Philip*, * even after the Eunuch had discover'd his willingness, and ask'd for Baptism, requires a hearty Faith, as a necessary Condition even in Persons ever so willing: *If thou believest with all thine heart, thou may'st* be baptiz'd; and not else, tho you desire it ever so much.

But the Instances of this kind are too numerous to be all repeated, and withal so very easy and obvious, that it is needless to do it; for all the Passages in Scripture, which any way relate to the Apostles Practice in the Matter, are of this kind. Of St. *Paul* and *Barnabas*, when they came to *Derbe*, 'tis said, † *they had preach'd the Gospel in that City, and had taught many.* The Word in the Original, here rendred *taught*, is the same with that in the Commission; which makes this Passage the more considerable, in that it shews the Practice of the

* Acts viii. 37. † Acts xiv. 21.

Apos-

Apoſtles, and at the ſame time determines the Senſe of that *Greek* Word to be as we contend.

But the parallel Places to the Commiſſion, *Matth.* xxviii. 19. put the Senſe of it beyond diſpute: for St. *Mark* expreſſes it thus; * *Go ye into all the World, and preach the Goſpel to every Creature*, &c. St. *Luke*, with reference to the ſame thing, ſays, † *That Repentance and Remiſſion of Sins ſhould be preach'd in his Name among all Nations.* And St. *Peter* himſelf, who receiv'd the Commiſſion immediately from the Mouth of our LORD, aſſures us this was his Sacred Meaning; for ‖ *he commanded us*, ſays he, *to preach to the People*, &c. all which ſets the Matter in the cleareſt Light imaginable. And therefore, I think, I may ſafely conclude from the whole, that 'tis fully demonſtrated to be one of the plaineſt things in the World that μαθητεύω ſignifys properly to *teach*, and that this is the Senſe of it particularly in the Commiſſion, *Matth.* xxviii. 19. And therefore our Adverſarys when they cavil at this Senſe, do at beſt but trifle, and contradict the conſtant Uſe of the *Greek* Word, and common Senſe of Mankind; the unanimous Agreement of the ſeveral Verſions; the joint Authority of the Primitive Saints; the Judgment of the moſt Learned Men; and the clear Meaning and Declarations of the SPIRIT of GOD in the Holy Scriptures.

The Argument I advanc'd then, remains in its full force and unanſwer'd: namely, that ſince this Commiſſion impowers to baptize only ſuch as it firſt commands to be taught, there is no warrant for baptizing Infants contain'd in it; but on the contrary, Infants are effectually excluded, ſuch Conditions being made neceſſary as

* Mark xvi. 15. † Luke xxiv. 47. ‖ Acts x. 42.

they are not capable of. And therefore, well might I conclude as I did, that the Scriptures do not leave the Matter ſo doubtful as our Adverſarys pretend. This very much alters the Caſe from what Mr. *Wall* repreſents it to be, and ſhews his Scheme is not well laid: ſo material an Error being diſcover'd in his very Foundation.

I deſign'd to have added ſome other Conſiderations to the ſame Purpoſe: but what I have inſiſted on at large, eſpecially the Senſe of *Matth.* xxviii. 19. which is in it ſelf ſo conſiderable a Part of the Diſpute, and ſo eſſential to the Determination of it; does plainly demonſtrate, that the Scriptures are not ſilent, but do ſufficiently declare the Baptiſm of Infants to be no Divine Inſtitution; and that the Commiſſion to baptize was not intended to include Infants, but purpoſely excludes 'em. Shou'd our Author therefore be able to prove ever ſo ſolidly that the *Jews* and Primitive Chriſtians did uſe to baptize their Proſelytes together with their Infant Children, we ſhou'd notwithſtanding have very good Grounds to reject the Practice. And this is the firſt thing I undertook to make out. What I have ſo largely and particularly ſaid concerning ſome *Greek* Words, does, I confeſs, look like Pedantry and Affectation: but the Tenaciouſneſs of our Adverſarys, who are not ſatisfy'd with a few Inſtances, together with your Commands, Sir, are my Excuſe. I am,

Yours, *&c.*

LETTER

LETTER IX.

Mr. Wall's *Attempt founded on Mistake. His Pretences from the* Jews *examin'd: which he has collected from the learned Men who best understood their Writings. Their Authority of no weight: the Reasons they go upon being too weak. 'Tis without sufficient Ground that our Author asserts, the* Jews *make it plain they baptiz'd their Proselytes before* CHRIST's *time. His Authoritys too late. Great Alterations introduc'd in a short time. The Passages produc'd by Mr.* Wall *don't so much as intimate that the* Jews *baptiz'd Proselytes in our* SAVIOUR's *time. There is no necessity to understand the Words in Mr.* Wall's *Sense. The* Jews *us'd to baptize for the Pollution contracted in Circumcision: which may be the Baptism spoken of in the* Talmud. *Some of the* Rabbins *plainly shew us they neither knew nor allow'd of any initiatory Baptism. They ridicule our Baptism as a fanciful Ceremony, as appears from the Antient* Nizzachon, *which fixes the Rise of the Practice in* CHRIST; *and mentions it as an Initiation peculiar to Christians: and opposes to it the* Jewish *Circumcision only. It appears further from* Rab. Isaac. *So that the* Jewish *Writings, if any thing, prove contrary to our Author's Opinion. The Authority of the* Rabbins *very insignificant, and never to be depended on. Their Writings in general stuff'd with very foolish Romantic Tales. Their fabulous and ridiculous way of accounting for* CHRIST's *Power of Miracles, from* Toldoth Jeschu. *More Instances of their ridiculous Whimsys, from the* Talmud. *Their foolish Misapplication of Scripture.*

Their impious Repreſentations of God. *A fabulous Account of the Origin of* Rome. *Another concerning* R. Eliezer, *in Confirmation of their Traditions. The* Pirke *of* Eliezer. *Another Reaſon why the* Rabbins *are not to be rely'd on it, that they profeſs to follow their Doctors in all they aſſert, tho ever ſo abſurd. They prefer their* Talmud *and* Traditions *before the Scriptures themſelves. The Character of the* Rabbins. *Their exceſſive Pride. Their way of interpreting the Scriptures. The* Sanhedrim, *tho made up of their beſt Men, conſiſted only of Magicians, as themſelves aſſert, &c. They have endeavour'd to corrupt the Scriptures. All Learned Men give the ſame Character of the* Jews *and their Writings. So Mr.* Le Clerc. *Mr.* Du Pin. *Mr.* Dodwell. Scaliger. Nauclerus. Buxtorf. Lightfoot. *And the ſame Character is given of 'em by* Christ *himſelf too, who cenſures 'em more particularly on account of their Waſhings. Their Traditions were many and miſchievous. All theſe things apply'd to the preſent Diſpute.*

SIR,

IN my laſt, I made it appear that Mr. *Wall* is guilty of an Error in the very Groundwork of his Syſtem; which, of it ſelf, utterly ſubverts the whole. For what is built on an Error, that is, on a Nullity, has no real Foundation, and muſt ſink of courſe: and I hope to ſatisfy you in the Sequel that every part of his Scheme, and all his Arguments ſtand on the ſame foot, and are as ill ſupported. For to ſay, the *Jews* did initiate their Proſelytes and their Infants by Baptiſm, and that the Apoſtles and Primitive Church baptiz'd the Infants of believing Parents, are miſtakes; and the Arguments brought to prove theſe two Points are no better.

First,

Firſt, We will examine what our Author ſays as to the Practice of the *Jews*; and we ſhall ſoon ſee he comes very ſhort of proving that they did in our SAVIOUR's time, and before, initiate Proſelytes by Baptiſm. His Teſtimonys from the *Jewiſh* Writings, he ſays, are taken from the moſt Learned and Judicious Authors, who beſt underſtood that ſort of Learning: ſo that we may expect in Mr. *Wall* the united ſtrength of our ableſt Adverſarys all brought.

'Tis conſiderable, I confeſs, that ſo many Learned Men favour the Opinion; but it will appear from the Reaſons they give for it, that they were too credulous, and entertain'd it too eaſily, which leſſens their Authority very much. Mr. *Wall* intimates that he is not very capable of ſearching into the *Rabbinical* Writings himſelf; but he and all Men are able to judg whether the Arguments urg'd from 'em, are ſufficient to juſtify the Pædobaptiſt Doctrine.

Our Author argues firſt from the *Jews* themſelves, who, he ſays, make it † *fully to appear that the Cuſtom of the* Jews *before our* SAVIOUR's *time was to baptize as well as circumciſe any Proſelyte*, &c. But this is too haſtily affirm'd. Several Inſtances I know are and may be produc'd, which are expreſs; but it does not therefore follow, that the Matter muſt be ſo clear and evident: on the contrary it ſeems a doubtful Caſe at beſt, even from thoſe very Paſſages they cite (if they are ſuppos'd to be the beſt) whether this Cuſtom be ſo antient as 'tis pretended; for tho they plainly ſpeak of their Baptiſm, they don't prove it was practis'd in CHRIST's time, much leſs before it.

I think Mr. *Wall* cites only the two *Talmuds*, *Maimonides*, and *Rabbi Solomon*, to confirm his Aſ-

† Introd. pag. 3.

ſertion. Now ſeveral of the greateſt *Rabbins*, * as *Serira Gaon*, *Jehuda Ben-Levi*, the Author of *Meor Enajim*, *Abraham Ben-David*, *Rab. Minchas*, *Iſaac Abravanel*, &c. and from theſe the moſt Learned Chriſtian Writers ſay, The antienteſt Part of the *Talmud*, namely that which is call'd the *Miſchna*, was not compil'd till about 150 Years after the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*. *Buxtorf* ſays, The *Jeruſalem Talmud* was compil'd by *Rab. Jochanan* 230 Years after CHRIST †: but the *Gemara*, which is the far greateſt Part of the *Babylonick Talmud*, was not made till 500 Years after CHRIST, nor till 311 after the *Miſchna*, according to *Abraham Ben-David* and *Ganz* ‖. *Maimonides* liv'd not till above 1100 Years after CHRIST. Their own Chronologiſt places the Birth of our LORD *An.* 3761 **, and the time of *Maimonides* about 4927 ††, that is, 1166 Years after; and *Rabbi Solomon* liv'd much about the ſame time, or according to *Ganz* ‖‖, but 60 Years ſooner.

Now, Sir, can any reaſonable Man take the Reports of Authors who wrote ſo long after the Times they ſpeak of, for a ſufficient Proof of what was done ſo long before they were born? Had they cited any others who liv'd in, or ſo near the Time of our SAVIOUR, as to know what was then practis'd, the Caſe wou'd have been different, and we muſt have had recourſe to the Authors they mention'd; but ſince they have not done this, I think I may ſay *Maimonides*, tho a

* Vid. R. D. Ganz in Tzemach David, ad An. 978. Millen. 4.

† Abbreviatur. pag. 242.

‖ Tzemach David an An. 260. Millen. 5.

** Ganz Tzemach David, Lib. 2.

†† Ibid. Lib. 1.

‖‖ Tzemach David, Lib. 1. ad An. 4865.

great

great Man, cou'd know and relate what was done 1100 Years before he was born, no better than any other Man can now. And therefore such Authoritys in this Case may justly be rejected: for every one knows how little Men, who write at such a distance from the Times they speak of, are to be depended on, any further than they produce some more Antient and Authentick Testimonies of one kind or other, in confirmation of what they say.

The *Mischna*, or Text of the *Talmud*, tho much the antientest Authority produc'd, is not wholly clear of this Exception. And if the Sense of the Places transcrib'd be fairly represented, at most it carrys the matter no higher than to 150 Years after the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, (which happen'd *Anno* CHRISTI 70) that is 210 Years after CHRIST. But will it follow, that because this Book mentions the *Jews* baptizing their Proselytes, therefore they us'd to do so above 200 Years before it was written? We are convinc'd by many Examples what 200 Years can do in such Cases. In the very Case of Baptism among our selves in *England*, the manner of *Dipping*, in about one quarter part of the time, was totally disus'd, and *sprinkling* substituted in its stead, and urg'd as the most suitable way, and as lawful as the other which was more antient; and all this not only *without*, as Dr. *Whitby* notes, but likewise contrary to the Allowance of the Institutor, the Approbation of the Establish'd Church, and that express Determination of the Council held under *Kenwolfe*, which I mention'd before *. And where's the necessity to suppose the fanciful *Jews* more constant and uniform in Religious Matters than our selves? Their frequent and sudden Relapses into

* Pag. 213.

Idolatry under their Judges and Kings, are Inſtances of a different Temper.

But not to inſiſt upon this: The Paſſages cited by Mr. *Wall* are ſo far from proving, that not one of 'em does ſo much as aſſert or intimate, that the Baptiſm of Proſelytes was in uſe in our SAVIOUR's time: how then cou'd he pretend it was ſo plain a Caſe? The firſt Citation he reads thus: *When a Proſelyte is receiv'd, he muſt be circumcis'd; and when he is circumcis'd, they baptize him in the Preſence of two wiſe Men*, &c. But what of this? It ſhews indeed what was the Method when this was written: but from what Words is it to be collected, that the ſame Cuſtom had been obſerv'd for 200 Years before? which was the thing to be prov'd.

Beſides, there is no neceſſity to underſtand the Words in Mr. *Wall*'s Senſe: and if it ſhou'd be argu'd that they do not ſpeak of an initiatory Baptiſm, but only a Purification from the Blood of Circumciſion, with which the Patient is ſuppos'd to be defil'd; I don't ſee which way our Author wou'd be able to defend his Conſtruction. The Commentarys on the *Miſchna*, which are conſiderably later, perhaps may be allow'd in ſome meaſure to favour our Author; but the *Miſchna* it ſelf may very well mean another thing. For as *Maimonides* notes, † *The Stile of it is ſhort, and capable of diverſe Senſes.* That the *Jews*, on account of ſeveral kinds of Pollution, us'd to purify themſelves by waſhing, can't be queſtion'd; the *diverſe Waſhings* mention'd in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* ||, make it inconteſtable. And 'tis plain enough, that upon ſome ſuch Notion, they were waſh'd after the Sore of Circumciſion was heal'd,

† Porta Moſis, pag. 78, 79. || Chap. ix. 10.

as

as are also the *Mahometans* ‖ to this day from them. And this Pollution seems to have been contracted from the Blood of Circumcision; for thus the *Chaldee* Paraphrase which goes under the Name of *Jonathan*'s, interprets the Words *Ezek.* xvi. 6. of the Blood of Circumcision, from which *ver.* 9. GOD says, He wash'd and cleans'd 'em: and the *Jews* in their second Benediction † after Circumcision apply the Words in the same manner. And therefore 'tis observable, even all natural-born *Jews* were wash'd with this Baptism, except only Females, as Dr. *Hyde* * likewise notes, who not being circumcis'd, were not wash'd till they had contracted Pollution some other way: and this plainly intimates that there was a Baptism thought necessary on account of Circumcision, or some Pollution contracted thereby; otherwise Persons who had been circumcis'd wou'd not have been oblig'd to a Baptism, from which others who cou'd not be circumcis'd were excus'd.

Why then mayn't the *Talmud* be understood to mean only this washing for Pollution by Circumcision? This was to be done as soon as the Cure of the Sore was accomplish'd, and so was that spoken of in the *Talmud:* they are the same therefore in respect to Time, and I don't understand how a Person cou'd be wash'd with two different Washings at one and the same time.

Further, the Antiquity, *&c.* of the Practice is rendred dubious by the Disagreement of the *Rabbins.* Some plainly assert it; and others as plainly intimate they neither knew nor allow'd of such an initiatory Ceremony. There is no need to

‖ Bobov. de Turcarum Liturgia, pag. 23. & Compend. Theol. Moham. per Reland, pag. 59.

† Vid. Buxtorf. Synag. Judaic. pag. 100.

* In Not. 39. ad Bobov. Tract. pag. 22. a.

be

be large in the Proof of this; and therefore I ſhall inſtance but in one Author or two.

They who have read their Writings againſt the Chriſtians, muſt have obſerv'd they ridicule the Sacrament of Baptiſm as an unaccountable and fanciful Ceremony. The anonymous Author of the antienteſt *Nizzachon* frequently touches upon it with his uſual Gall, and wou'd expoſe it as very abſurd and fooliſh; which to me is a clear Argument he did not apprehend that our Baptiſm was borrow'd from the *Jews*; nay he argues againſt it in one Place, where he ſays, * *It is no where commanded to plunge Perſons or Proſelytes into the Water. Why therefore does* JESUS *command to do ſo?* The Author muſt needs be underſtood to ſpeak here of the Baptiſm of Proſelytes; for he cou'd not have ſaid in general of all other Baptiſms, they are no where commanded. In another Place, attempting to ſhew the Inſignificancy and Uſeleſneſs of our Sacred Inſtitution, he ſays, † *From what Sin or Uncleanneſs does this Baptiſm purify? What Sin or Pollution is there in Infant Children, that ye baptize them?* His oppoſing our Baptiſm ſo eagerly, muſt import they had no ſuch thing in uſe among them. The whole Page indeed is to our purpoſe, but there are two or three Words I can't well paſs by: the *Rabbin* had ſaid, that Chriſtians ought to be circumcis'd in Imitation of CHRIST and the Apoſtles, as well as baptiz'd in Imitation of 'em: to which, in the Name of the

---

* Pag. 53. אבל להשליך בן אדם במים לא נכתב מעולם כי למה זה היה לו לצורת לישו טבילה זו

† Ibid. pag. 192. שמע טבילתם מה חטא וטומאה רוחה: וכי ילד קטון שהם טובלים

Chriſti-

Chriſtians, he makes this Objection, ‖ *That* CHRIST *came to renew the Law, and that he had laid aſide or aboliſh'd Circumciſion, but inſtituted Baptiſm.* The *Rabbin*'s blaſphemous Anſwer to this ſhall not be repeated, as making nothing to the Point; only we may obſerve, the Objection places the Riſe and Validity of Baptiſm in CHRIST's Inſtitution: and the *Jew* does not, in contradiction, ſay, it was borrow'd from them; or that ſince it had been a Practice under their Diſpenſation, there was as much reaſon to aboliſh that as Circumciſion, or the like: for a cavilling, quarelſom *Jew* might have ſaid a hundred ſuch idle things on this occaſion, if he had underſtood that CHRIST adopted the Ceremony from them.

Perhaps ſome may think theſe Citations from the antient *Nizzachon* don't prove, that the Author of it knew of no ſuch Baptiſm among the *Jews* as he found practis'd by the Chriſtians; therefore I will add, that he expreſly fixes the Riſe of the Practice in CHRIST and St. *John* his Forerunner; for he makes theſe trifling Reflections on *John*'s Baptiſm, and the Words in *Matth.* iii. 5, 6. † *But what ſignify'd all this? Who gave* John *Power and Authority to inſtitute this Baptiſm? Upon what Law cou'd he ground the Fancy? neither on the Old nor the New.* Had it been a Cuſtom among themſelves, 'twou'd have been eaſy to ſee from whence St. *John* deriv'd it, and the *Rabbin* wou'd not have fail'd to put us in mind how much we were beholden to them for the ſubſtantial Cere-

---

‖ ישו בא וחידש את התורה ועזב את המילה וציוה הטבילה:

† Ibid. pag. 195. וכל כך למה ומי ציוה ליוחנן לעשות זאת הטבילה: באיזה תורה מצאו לא בקרמונית ולא בחדשה:

monys

monys of our Religion; and that we copy'd our Rite of Initiation from their Traditions.

In another Place, upon the Story of the young Man who ask'd our LORD, what he muſt do *to inherit eternal Life*, Mark x. 17, *&c.* this ſame Writer obſerves, that CHRIST † *does not command him to be baptiz'd*, nor take any notice of that novel Invention, *but only inculcates to him the Old Commandments.* By which Oppoſition of *Old Commandments* to *Baptiſm*, he plainly ſignifys, that he took the Baptiſm of CHRIST to be a new Inſtitution of his own, and ſomething ſingular too, or at leaſt not us'd by themſelves; elſe he wou'd not have been ſo much diſturb'd at it, and argu'd againſt it ſo frequently. He mentions Baptiſm alſo as the Initiation peculiar to Chriſtians, and oppoſes to it Circumciſion only, as the Initiation of Proſelytes to *Judaiſm.* The Paſſage is longer than I am willing to tranſcribe, and therefore I refer you to the Book it ſelf ‖.

The Senſe however is much the ſame with what *Rab. Iſaac* has expreſs'd in theſe Words: * *They have abrogated Circumciſion, and ſubſtituted Baptiſm in its ſtead; as they have likewiſe done with the Sabbath, inſtead of which they obſerve the firſt Day of the Week.*

---

† Pag. 221. לא אמר לך ועשה טבילה אלא מצוות קדמוניות ציוה לו

‖ Page 242. 243, and 251.

* Chiſſuk Emunah, pag. 401. בטלו מצות מילה וקבעו שמר תחתיה וכן בטלו שביתת יום השבת ושובתים תחתיו ביום הראשון וכן בטלו כלל המצות ——— זולת קצת מן דעריות שנזהרין &c.

This

This is exceeding plain; for as they kept a new Day instead of the antient one, so he says they have *in like manner* substituted a new Ceremony of Initiation instead of the old one: nay, in the very next Words he complains the Christians *have abolish'd the whole Law, and all the divine Precepts which the Law makes necessary, except only some things in relation to Incest*, &c. Here he enumerates some of the moral Precepts, but does not mention Baptism at all; which therefore I argue was, in this Author's Judgment, no Institution of *Moses*, nor practis'd by the *Jews* before CHRIST, because he asserts the Christians had abolish'd all Rites besides those excepted, in the number of which he has not plac'd Baptism.

And when some Christians had objected to the *Jews*, that they only circumcis'd the Males, without using any initiatory Ceremony for Females, whereas the Christians by Baptism initiate both Sexes: If the *Jews* had us'd Baptism, they might have reply'd, they did as much as the Christians: and yet the Author of (*a*) *Nizzachon* does not make the least mention of it, but turns off the Objection another way.

What has been said, makes it, I think, very clear,

1. That the Passages Mr. *Wall* cites from the Text of the *Talmud*, may only speak of Baptism for Purification, and not of Baptism for Proselytes.

2. That none of the *Jewish* Writings, produc'd by him, do assert or imply, that Proselytes were in, or so much as near CHRIST's Time, usually initiated by Baptism; which however was what our Author shou'd have prov'd: But on the contrary,

(*a*) Pag. 251. *med.*

3. Some

3. Some of the Rabbins manifeſtly ſpeak of that Chriſtian Ceremony as an Invention of St. *John* and our SAVIOUR; and affirm it expreſly to be altogether new, and not grounded upon any Law. From all which I may ſafely conclude, that the ſaid *Jewiſh* Writings are very far from proving what our Author, and the Gentlemen he tranſcribes, have undertaken to eſtabliſh. For, in ſhort, if any thing is to be collected from 'em, 'tis the contrary to that Opinion: none of 'em ſay as our Author does, that the *Jews before and in our* SAVIOUR's *Time*, us'd to baptize their Proſelytes; but ſome, as I have ſhewn you, directly aſſert, that this initiatory Ceremony was not practis'd till St. *John*'s and CHRIST's Appearance, whom they make to be the firſt Authors of it: ſo that it cou'd not be borrow'd from the *Jews*. And as for any later Practices of this bewilder'd People, they can be of no uſe to illuſtrate our LORD's Deſign in the Inſtitution. And indeed, 'tis at beſt a very odd Attempt, to put ſo violent an Interpretation on our LORD's Words, merely from the Authority of the Rabbins.

But in anſwer to Mr. *Wall*'s arguing from the *Jewiſh* Writings, I have this farther to ſay, that if the Rabbins had univerſally aſſerted in ſo many Words, *That the* Jews *always did uſe to initiate their Proſelytes by Baptiſm*; *and that St.* John *and* JESUS CHRIST *borrow'd the Ceremony from them*; I ſhou'd nevertheleſs think it the greateſt Folly and Madneſs in the World, to believe it on their ſole Authority. All who are acquainted with the *Jews* know, it is not without very good reaſon that I ſay this; for they are a deſpicable, ignorant, and whimſical ſort of Writers, whoſe Credit is at the loweſt ebb imaginable.

Tho

Tho this Character of 'em is notorious enough; yet becauſe our Adverſarys mention the Rabbins ſo much in this Diſpute, and † Dr. *Hammond* calls their Authority (not over-prudently) *the true Baſis of Infant-Baptiſm*; I think my ſelf oblig'd to confirm what I here advance, being under a kind of Promiſe likewiſe to aſſign ſome of the Reaſons which prove the Rabbins and their Writings are of no Weight, and that their Teſtimony can't be rely'd on by any who love the Truth, and take a prudent Care not to be impos'd on, in their Search after it.

1. In purſuance of this, Sir, I'll firſt give you a Taſte of their Writings, whereby you may judg what romantick Authors they are. All their Books, and almoſt every Page in 'em, are ſo full of Paſſages which demonſtrate this, that I'm at a Loſs where to begin, and what to ſingle out; for to mention all of this kind, wou'd be to tranſcribe their whole Books: But I will only preſent a Specimen, which ſhall convince you what Gallimaufrys make up their Compoſitions. That deteſtable Libel, entitl'd, *Toldoth Jeſchu*, is fill'd with nothing elſe but the groſſeſt Falſhoods and Blaſphemys, and all aſſerted with as much Aſſurance, and under ſuch pretences of Seriouſneſs and Honeſty, as if they were certain Truths. It wou'd be criminal barely to repeat Words ſo extravagantly Impious, wherewith they ſlanderouſly abuſe and affront the LORD *of Life*; and therefore if you deſire to know more particularly what that baſe Author writes, I refer you to the Book it ſelf, rather than blot my Paper with the Repetition of many things it contains.

Some however of the leſs ſhocking I'll venture to mention: The many and prodigious Miracles

† *Six Querys*, p. 195. Margin.

our

our LORD wrought were too apparent and certain to be deny'd; and therefore these Authors wou'd, with their Fathers, evade the Force of 'em, by attributing 'em to Enchantments, and the Power of Devils. The Relation is very long, however I'll begin it, because it may shew what Heed is to be given to their Traditions; and what reason Christians have to regard those Writers, who can thus traduce the most innocent and unspotted Life that ever was in History, and obstinately disown the most apparent Operations of a divine Power. David, *the King*, they say, *in digging the Foundation, found a Stone laid over the Mouth of a Pit, on which was inscrib'd the Proper Name of* GOD: *this he caus'd to be taken up, and plac'd in the Holy of Holies. And the wise Men fearing lest some over-curious young Men might learn this Name, and by the Power of it cause great Disturbances in the World; made, by their Magick Art, two brazen Lions, which they set at the Door of the Holy of Holies, one on the right hand, and the other on the left; that if any shou'd enter in, and learn this secret Name, the Lions, as he came out again, shou'd, by roaring, strike him with such Terror and Confusion, as to cause him entirely to forget the Name he had learn'd. Now the Rumour being spread, that* JESUS, *&c. he left the upper* Galilee, *and came privately to* Jerusalem, *and entring into the Temple, learn'd the Holy Letters, and writ the incomprehensible Name on a Parchment; and first uttering the Name as a Charm that he might not feel any Pain, he cut a Gash in his Flesh, and put into it the Parchment which contain'd the mysterious Name; and then immediately pronouncing the Name again, the Flesh was perfectly heal'd up as at first.* ——— *As he came out, the brazen Lions set up their Roar, and frighted the Name quite out of his Mind. Upon which, he went immediately without the City; and, opening the Flesh, took out the*

hidden

hidden Parchment, and by these means again learnt the powerful Name. After this, he went into Bethlehem *of* Judea, *the Place of his Nativity, and began to cry with a loud Voice, and say,* &c. *I am born of a pure Virgin,* &c. *I am the* Son *of* God, *and the Prophet* Esaias *propheſy'd of me, saying,* Behold a Virgin shall conceive, *&c. I made even my self; and the Heavens and the Earth, the Sea, and all things, were made by me. Upon this, some ask him, saying, Shew us by some Sign or Wonder that thou art* God. *To whom he answer'd, saying, Bring hither a dead Body, and I will raise it to Life. With that, they fell to digging up a Grave with all Expedition; and finding nothing but dry Bones, they told him, we have found here only the Bones. Well, bring 'em here into the midst, says he. And when they had brought 'em, he fitted every Bone to its Place, cover'd 'em with Skin, and Flesh, and Nerves; and the Body became alive, and arose, and stood on its Feet: and the whole Company saw the Wonder, and was amaz'd. ——— Bring hither a Leper, says he, and I will heal him. And when they had brought one to him, he in like manner heal'd him by the incomprehensible Name: which when they that were with him saw, they fell down before him, and worship'd him, saying, Thou art indeed the* Son *of* God.

With what amazing Impudence and Blasphemy is this absurd Fable related! The whole Libel is of apiece with this, and a remarkable Instance of Rabbinical Honesty and Good Sense; which should never be forgotten. The same Libel continues thus:

One of the wise Men propos'd to the rest, If it may be thought fit, let one of us also learn the Name, and thereby be enabled to do these Wonders as well as He, and perhaps by these means we may take Him. The Sanhedrim approv'd of the Advice, and decreed, that

whoſoever ſhou'd learn the Name, and thereby diſcover and expoſe JESUS, *he ſhou'd receive a double Reward in the other World. Then one of the wiſe Men whoſe Name was* Judas, *ſtood up, and ſaid, I will learn it.* — And then they add the following Story: JESUS *ſaid, Does not* Eſaias *propheſy of me? and my great Forefather* David *likewiſe ſays of me,* The LORD ſaid unto my LORD, *&c. And again,* Thou art my SON, this Day, *&c. And now I will aſcend to my* FATHER *who is in Heaven, and I will ſit at his right hand; and this I will do before your Faces; but thou* Judas *ſhalt never come there. Then* JESUS *immediately pronouncing the mighty Name, a ſudden Wind aroſe and carry'd him into the Air, where he remain'd between Heaven and Earth.* Judas *in like manner pronouncing the Name, was alſo carry'd up, and ſo they both flew about in the Air, to the great Amazement of all the Spectators. But* Judas *again pronouncing the Name, falls on* JESUS, *deſigning to caſt him down headlong; while* JESUS *alſo pronouncing the Name, endeavour'd to caſt down* Judas: *and thus they continu'd ſtruggling together. But when* Judas *ſaw he cou'd not prevail againſt* JESUS, *he urin'd, and ſprinkl'd it upon him; by which being render'd unclean, they both fell down to the Earth together, and were depriv'd of the Power of the incomprehenſible Name, till they had waſh'd themſelves.*

If you pleaſe, you may ſee more ſtill of their Nonſenſe and intolerable blaſphemous Reflections on the Bleſſed JESUS, collected by *Vorſtius* in his Obſervations on *D. Ganz*'s Chronology, at *Page* 257, *&c.*

Tho theſe Writers don't always vomit out the ſame Malice as when they treat this Subject, yet they ever fall into the ſame Deliriums of a rambling Fancy, and ſcorn to be confin'd, ſo much as even to Probability and Decorum. I will make out this even from their *Talmud* it ſelf,

ſelf, for which they have all ſo great a Veneration. 'Tis a Medley, a Hotchpotch of the moſt ridiculous and ſenſeleſs Fictions, and a vaſt Collection of Foolerys: and you will ſee I don't wrong it, when you look over the following Inſtances.

* *As the wiſe Men were once ſitting in the Gate, two Lads paſs'd by 'em; one according to the Cuſtom kept his Head cover'd, but the other uncover'd his Head. Of him that had uncover'd his Head,* R. Eliezer *ſaid, He was a Baſtard.* R. Joſhua *ſaid, He was the Son of a Woman ſet apart for Uncleanneſs. But* R. Akiba *ſaid, he was both a Baſtard, and the Son of an unclean Woman. The reſt of the wiſe Men ſay to* R. Akiba, *How comes it to paſs, that you contradict your Companions? He anſwer'd, I will confirm what I have ſaid: and preſently goes to the Mother of the Lad, whom he found in the Market ſelling Pulſe. He ſays to her; Daughter, if you will ſatisfy me in the thing I ſhall ask you,* † *I will make you to enter into eternal Life. Says ſhe, Swear to me. Whereupon* R. Akiba ‖ *did ſwear with his Lips, but not in his Heart,* &c. And after this, he put the Queſtion to her, which ſhe anſwer'd, proving the Perſon to be illegitimate, *&c.*

Such Tales as theſe, which the greateſt Rabbins ſo gravely employ themſelves in, wou'd not paſs with old Women and Children in a Winter-Evening. Beſides, you may obſerve their Integrity here: *R. Akiba* is repreſented ſwearing falſly, in contempt of the Decalogue; tho at other times

---

* Maſſechet Challa.

† אני מביאך לחיי עולם

‖ ושבע בשפתיו ומכטל בלבו

he is call'd the † *Glory of the Law:* and was ſo nicely conſcientious of keeping the Traditions of the Elders, that when he was in Priſon, and wanted Water to drink, he choſe rather to waſh his Hands with what he had, than drink it to ſatisfy his Thirſt, ſaying, * *I had better die with Thirſt, than tranſgreſs the Traditions of the Elders.* And yet this Zealot made nothing of Perjury; which is all one as to ſay, the Traditions of the Elders are more to be regarded than the Law of GOD.

And what Arrogance and Blaſphemy is it for the vile Wretch to aſſume to himſelf the Power of admitting into Heaven, and diſtributing Rewards there; when this, we know, is ſolely the Prerogative of the Eternal KING? and bleſſed be His Name that it is ſo!

The Talmudical Treatiſe they call *Sanhedrim* has the following inſipid Paſſage. *Our Rabbins tell us, that* JESUS *had five Diſciples,* Mathai, Nakai, Nezer, Bona, *and* Thoda. *When* Mathai *was brought into Court, he argu'd, Shou'd* Mathai *be put to Death, ſeeing it is written* (מתי Mathai) When ſhall I come and appear before GOD? *But they anſwer'd him, Ought not* Mathai *to die, when it is written* (מתי Mathai) When ſhall he die, and his Name periſh?

Afterwards they brought in Nakai; *and he pleaded, Shall* Nakai *be put to Death, tho it be written,* The innocent (*i. e.* נקי) and righteous ſlay thou not? *But they anſwer'd him, Shou'd not* Nakai *die, when 'tis ſaid,* In the ſecret Places doth he murder the Innocent (נקי).

---

† *Sota.* כבוד התרה

* *Joma.* טוב אמות מיתת עצמי ולא אעבור על דעת חברי.

After

After him they brought in Nezer, *who ſaid, Shall* Nezer *be put to Death, when it is written* (נצר Nezer) a Branch ſhall grow out of his Roots? *To whom they anſwer'd, Shall not* Nezer *be put to Death, ſeeing it is written,* Thou art caſt out of thy Grave like an abominable Branch? (*i. e.* in Hebrew נצר *Nezer*).

Next they brought Boni, *and he argu'd, Shall* Boni *die, when 'tis ſaid,* Iſrael is my Son (בני), my Firſt-Born? *But they anſwer'd, Shall not* Boni *die, when 'tis written,* I will ſlay thy Son (בנך) even thy Firſt-Born.

Laſt of all, they bring Thoda, *who pleaded, Shall* Thoda *be put to Death, when it is written,* A Pſalm of Praiſe? (לתודה) *to which they anſwer'd, Shall not* Thoda *be put to Death, ſeeing it is written,* Whoſo offers Praiſe (or לתודה) glorifys me?

In one place the Talmud ſays, * *There are three Watches in the Night; in every one of which the Holy and Ever-bleſſed ONE roars out for Grief like a Lion, and ſays, Wo is Me, that I have made deſolate my Houſe, and burnt my Temple, and that I have made my Children captive to the Heathen!* Surely none but Madmen wou'd dare to make ſuch groſly wicked Repreſentations of the infinite Majeſty of GOD.

In the ſaid Tract, the Great GOD is a little after deſcrib'd howling in the ſame manner again: ſometimes he is repreſented praying; ſometimes weeping, *&c.* in this one Book, call'd *Berachoth*, which treats of Prayer and Thankſgiving. And

---

* Berachot. Fol. 3. a. שלש משמרית היו הלילה ועל כל משמר יושב הקבה ושואג כאדי ואומר אוי שהחרבתי את ביתי ושרפתי את היכלי ותגלית את בני לבין אומות העלם.

for an Eſſay of their Philoſophy and Divinity, let this ſuffice. * *When* GOD *calls to mind the Troubles of his Children among the* Gentiles, *it makes him drop two Tears into the Ocean, the ſound of which is heard from one end of the World to the other; and this is the cauſe of Earthquakes.*

I will tranſcribe one Paſſage more concerning GOD's weeping, tho it be pretty long, and very fooliſh: but it ſhews how groſs the Underſtandings of theſe Men are. † *Juſt as the Enemys went into the Sanctuary, and burnt it with Fire, the Bleſſed* GOD *ſaid, Now I ſhall have no Habitation upon Earth,* &c. —— *Then* GOD *mourn'd and lamented, ſaying, Wo is me! What have I done? I did ſuffer my Schechina to dwell in the World, becauſe of the* Jews; *but now they have ſinn'd, and I am return'd to my antient Habitation, I ſhall become the Scorn of the Nations,* &c. —— *While he was breathing out theſe Complaints,* Metatron *came, and proſtrating himſelf on his Face, cry'd, O thou* LORD *of the whole World, I will lament and mourn; but weep not Thou. To whom the Ever-bleſſed GOD made anſwer, If thou doſt not allow me to weep here, I'll give my ſelf wholly up to my Grief.* ——— *GOD came down; his holy Angels, and* Jeremiah *the Prophet going before him: when he came to his Temple, he ſaid, This doubtleſs is my Houſe, into which my Enemys have enter'd, and have done what they pleas'd. Then he began to grieve and lament: Wo is me! that my Houſe is deſtroy'd. O my Children! where are you?*

---

* Berachot. fol. 59. a. נשמע שהקב"ה זוכר את בניו ששרויים בצער בין אומות העולם מוריד שתי דמעות לים הגדול וקולם נשמע מסוף העולם ועד סופו והיינו גוהא.

† In Echa Rabbati, fol. 55. b.

you? O my Priests! where are you? O my Friends! where are you? What shall I do for you? I warn'd you, but you wou'd not repent. Then turning to Jeremiah, *he said*, &c.

I believe you are sufficiently tir'd with this Stuff; but I must desire you to read one Example or two more, from the great abundance of which the *Talmud* and Commentarys, *&c.* are made up. * *GOD kiss'd our Master* Moses *on the Mouth; and when he perceiv'd it took away his Breath, and that he was dead, he fell a weeping.* The Foundation and Origin of *Rome* is thus story'd in the *Talmud:* † *At that time, when* Salomon *married* Pharaoh's *Daughter, the Angel* Gabriel *descended, and fix'd a Reed in the Sea, which drew up the Mud, upon which was built that great City Rome.* This Fable is more at large set down in the *Midrasch Rabba Cantic. chap.* 1. *ver.* 6. *Buxtorf* has translated the Place in his *Talmudical Lexicon*, at the Word רומ, where he has also collected several other Passages which relate to this matter, from the *Talmuds* and *Midraschim:* all which does most abundantly shew the great Ignorance of these whimsical Historians; and that they are no more to be rely'd on, than the Popish *Legends* and *Lives of their Saints.*

Among other things which I am unwilling to pass by, is that strange Story of *R. Eliezer*, which I will endeavour to abbreviate what I can. After *Elie-*

---

* Midrasch. Chumasch prope fin. הקבה נשקו למשה רבינו ונטל נשמתו בנשיקת פה והיה הקבה בוכה.

† Sanhedrim fol. 21. b. שנשא שלמה את בת פרעה —— ירד גבריאל ונעץ קנה בים והעלה שירטון ועליו נבנה ברך גדול שברומי.

zer had done ſeveral ſtrange things to prove the true Tradition was in him, it follows, * *If I am poſſeſs'd of the Tradition*, ſays he, *let the neighbouring River teſtify it. And immediately the River turn'd its Current the contrary way.* But his Adverſarys not being ſatisfy'd with this, he ſays again: *If I hold the Truth, then let the Walls of this School bear witneſs of it: and immediately the Walls began to lean as if they wou'd fall. Upon which* R. Joſhua *cry'd out, and ſaid to the Walls, If the Diſciples of the wiſe Men diſpute among themſelves concerning Tradition, what is that to you, that you begin to move? At this, in reſpect to* Joſhua, *the Walls were withheld from falling quite down: and in honour to* Eliezer *they remain leaning to this day.* ——— R. Nathan, *by chance, met with* Elias, *and ask'd him, What GOD did at that time, when the Rabbins were ſo hotly engag'd concerning Tradition?* Elias *anſwer'd, Why truly, he laugh'd, and ſaid, My Children have conquer'd me, my Children have conquer'd me*, &c. Thus they approve themſelves to be what our SAVIOUR calls 'em, *blind Guides*, who lead the Blind, *&c.*

The magnify'd *Pirke* of *R. Eliezer*, which are adorn'd with the higheſt Encomiums of *Divine, Holy*, &c. are in like manner nothing elſe but a Collection of the ſame kind of ridiculous ſenſeleſs Storys, as thoſe which compoſe the *Talmud*. In one place, for Inſtance, reckoning up ſeven miraculous things, the fourth is this: † *That from the Creation, no Man had ever been ſick, but Men were taken with a ſudden Sneezing, and ſo ſneez'd out their Souls at their Noſes, till our Father* Jacob, *&c.* And ſo all the reſt of that admir'd Treatiſe is nothing elſe but ſuch like ſilly Whimſys, rak'd together without any Judgment or Deſign.

---

* Bava Metzia fol. 59. a. † Cap. 52.

Another

Another thing I wou'd obſerve to you, in order to ſhew how little the *Rabbins* are to be truſted in any thing they ſay, is the great Reſpect and Veneration they expreſs for their whimſical Doctors, and all their Traditions, which they publickly profeſs to follow, let 'em be ever ſo abſurd. Thus *R. Salomon Jarchi*, on *Deut.* xvii. 11. determines that the Wiſe Men muſt be ſubmitted to, even * *tho they ſhou'd ſay the right Hand is the left, and the left the right:* And therefore 'tis a Law in the *Talmud*, that † *whoſoever refuſes to obey the Wiſe Men, ſhall be put to Death.* And the great *Akiba*, as 'tis noted above, was ſo zealous for this, that he choſe rather to die of Thirſt, than not waſh his Hands according to the Traditions of the Elders, with that ſmall Portion of Water which was allow'd him in Priſon. And in the ſame Place there is this Sentence, ‖ *Whoſoever deſpiſes the Words of the Wiſe Men ſhall be caſt into Hell*; for according to *R. Ezechiah*, an Author of great Uſe and Authority among the *Jews*, ** *he that contradicts his Teacher, does as bad as if he contradicted* GOD *himſelf.*

Nor are they content with all this, but carry the Matter to a more impious Extreme, and even prefer the *Talmud* and the Impertinences of their Doctors before the Scriptures themſelves. There-

---

* אפילו אומר לך על ימין שהוא שמאל על שמאל שהוא ימין

† Tractat. Erubim. fol. 21. b. כל העובר על דברי סופרים חייב מיתה׃

‖ Erubim. fol. 21. b. שכל המלעיג על דברי חכמים נדון בצואה רותחת

** In Chaskuni, fol. 94. החולק על רבו וחולק כל השכינה׃

fore

fore they compare † the Text of the Bible to Water; but the Text of the *Talmud* to Wine: intimating the *Miſchna* does as much excel the Scriptures, as Wine does Water. And accordingly *R. Schem Tof* aſſerts, that ‖ *nothing is greater than the moſt holy* Talmud. And the *Talmudiſts* have the Vanity (or Impudence ſhall I ſay) to aſſert that even * GOD *himſelf, of the twelve Hours of the Day, ſpends three in the Study of the Law; and all the other nine in ſtudying the* Talmud. To ſuch an extravagant Degree of Frenzy and Pride are theſe *Wiſe Men* arriv'd.

From the whole it appears, that the *Talmud*, &c. of the *Jews* are a ſort of Writings full of ſenſleſs, ſcandalous Falſhoods, and therefore can be of no Credit or Authority at all.

2. In the ſecond Place it mayn't be amiſs to ſay ſome things relating to the Character of theſe *Rabbins*.

From what I have already ſaid it's plain they have always been exceedingly bigotted to their Wiſe Men, their *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, eſpecially the Members of their *Sanhedrim*, whoſe Aſſertions they are ever ready to ſubmit to with entire Reſignation and blind Obedience; which has prepar'd 'em to receive the groſſeſt Abſurditys and Falſhoods, and to ſwallow all the Dreams of the *Rabbins* for unexceptionable Truth and Matter of Fact.

And to this may be added their exceſſive Pride and Arrogance; for they think no body has any Senſe but themſelves. Thus *R. Schimeon* ſays: †† *There are but few Wiſe Men; if there are two, it*

† Tract. Sopherim. cap. 15.

‖ Mizbeach Hazzahab, cap. 5. התלמוד המקדיש אין למעלה ממנו

* Tract. Schabbath.

†† ראיתי בני עליה מועטים אם שנים הם אני ובני הם

miſs

must be I and my Son. *Maimonides*, without naming the Place indeed, cites ‖ this from the *Talmud*, *Tract. Succah. fol.* 45. b.

They were likewise much given to their Cabalistical Art, and that Part of it they call'd *Gematria*, whereby they made Words signify the same as any others they pleas'd to name, if the Letters of one did but make the same Number with the Letters of the other; and they thought there was no need of any Arguments but this numeral Likeness to confirm the Sense they gave a Word: so because, *Gen.* xi. 1. 'tis said, the whole Earth was of *one Language*, in *Hebrew* שפה אחת, which Letters make the Number 794, which by some mistake was taken to be the Number of לשון הקדש * also, hence they wou'd infer, that the Text means that the whole Earth spoke at that time the *Holy Language*, as 'tis call'd, *viz.* the *Hebrew*. And when *Ahasuerus* says to *Haman*, Esth. iii. 11. *the Silver is given thee, the People also, to do with them as it seemeth good to thee*; by the *Silver* they understand the King threaten'd him with the Gallows he was afterwards hang'd on: because כסף makes just the same Number as עץ, *viz.* 160; and by the same Rule not a Passage in Scripture but may be made to say any thing, and indeed a thousand different things together.

The *Sanhedrim*, which was compos'd of their greatest and best Men, consisted of a parcel of Magicians and Fortunetellers or Conjurers; for the *Talmud* it self says expressly that a Man is not receiv'd into that *august Assembly* unless he be † *well skill'd in the Black Art, and speaks*

‖ Porta Mosis, pag. 104.
* Chaskuni ad Gen. xi. 1.
† Menachoth, fol. 65. a. בעלי כשפים וירעים שבעים לשון

70 *Languages*, &c. a glorious Qualification indeed for Directors in Religion!

Another Charge I wou'd lay againſt 'em is, their corrupting and altering the Sacred Scriptures themſelves, out of which they have attempted to eraſe ſome Paſſages that did not pleaſe 'em. I will but juſt give a Quotation from St. *Juſtin Martyr* to this purpoſe, in his Diſpute with *Trypho* the *Jew*; he ſays thus: || *All thoſe Places of Scripture, which are manifeſtly contrary to their ſenſleſs Conceits, they wou'd evade by denying they are ſo written.* And again a little after, * *As for your* Rabbins *I have no credit for 'em, who have the Confidence to reject the Tranſlation made by the* 70 *Elders under* Ptolomey Philadelphus, *King of* Egypt, *and ſet themſelves up for Interpreters. And I wou'd have you underſtand, that they have wholly taken out and diſown many Paſſages of Scripture which are in this Tranſlation; from whence it is plainly prov'd to have been foretold, that this crucify'd Perſon was both* GOD *and Man, and that he ſhou'd be crucify'd and put to death.*

Amongſt other Places thus perfidiouſly obliterated by 'em, he inſtances in *Jer.* xi. 19. *But I was like a Lamb*, &c. which Verſe however he remarks was then remaining in ſome Copys in their Synagogues, and had been then but lately ſtruck out of

---

|| Pag. 294. B. Ἃ γὰρ ἂν διαῤῥήδην ἐν ταῖς γεγραμμέναις φαίνονται ἐλέγχονται αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀνόησιν καὶ φίλαυτον γνώμην, ταῦτα τολμῶσι λέγειν μὴ ὅτι γεγράφθαι.

* Pag. 297. B. Ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τοῖς Διδασκάλοις ὑμῶν πείθομαι, μὴ συνιεθεμένοις καλῶς ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεῖ ἑβδομήκοντα Πρεσβυτέρων. Ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ ἐξηγεῖσθαι πειρῶνται· καὶ ὅτι πολλὰς γραφὰς τέλεον πεπείληφαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξηγήσεων τῶν γεγραμμένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων Πτολεμαίῳ γεγραμμένων Πρεσβυτέρων, ἐξ ὧν διαῤῥήδην ὅτι ὁ σταυρωθεὶς, ὅτι ΘΕΟΣ, καὶ Ἄνθρωπος, καὶ σταυρούμενος, καὶ ἀποθνήσκων κεκηρυγμένος ἀποδείκνυται.

any

ny; and I think it is in all the *Hebrew* Copys, and other Translations now extant, as well as in that of the Seventy.

3. I am sensible I have treated the *Rabbins* pretty roughly; but am satisfy'd all I have said of 'em is exactly true: and since without blushing they offer such broad Affronts to the common Sense of all Mankind, and venture to treat the Divine Majesty both in the Person of the FATHER, and of the SON, so blasphemously, they deserve no favour. Besides, I am justify'd in this by the Judgment and Practice of all Learned Men.

Mr. *Le Clerc*, in this present Case in dispute, expresses the Doubtfulness and Insufficiency of the Authority of the *Rabbins*, by saying, * *The* Jews, *if we may venture to believe the* Rabbins, *receiv'd no Proselytes but by Baptism*, &c. More generally in another Place he says, † *The* Jews *seem to claim the Privilege of cashiering their Reason, and advance without any shame all the foolish Whimsys in the World: and wou'd yet pass for Men of very good Sense.* And to the same Purpose he frequently speaks on other Occasions.

Monsr. du Pin, when he wou'd give a Treatise he is speaking of, the worst Character he can, says, ‖ *It was writ by somebody who was wholly besotted with the dreaming Enthusiasms of the* Rabbins *and* Cabalists. Mr. *Dodwell*, speaking of the Use of the *Jewish* Writings, says, ** *Considering the* fabulousness *and* suspiciousness *of these* Rabbinical *Records in any*

* In Not. Gall. ad Matth. iii. 6. Les Juifs si nous en croyons les Rabbins ne recevoient, &c.

† Bibliotheque Choisie, Tom. 13. pag. 405. C'est là un Privelege des Juifs, de ne faire presque aucun Usage de leur Raison, de débiter, sans honte, toutes sortes de Rêveries, & de passer néanmoins pour habiles Gens.

‖ Hist. Eccles. Vol. 1. pag. 155. b.

** *Letter of Advice*, &c. 1. pag. 33.

thing

thing Hiſtorical, *I ſhou'd be much better ſatisfy'd with any Information from thoſe more* certainly ancient *Authors, which are extant in other Tongues, ſuch as* Philo *and* Joſephus, *&c. and indeed ſhall not credit the* Rabbins *any farther than as they agree with ſuch* better atteſted *Monuments, or with the* Nature *of Things atteſted by 'em.*

Scaliger ſays of *R. Aſcher*, who dwelt then at *Amſterdam*, that † *he was an ingenious Man for a* Jew. And a little after, ‖ *'Tis very ſeldom that a* Jew, *who turns Chriſtian, is good for any thing; they are always bad.* *Nauclerus* ſays of the *Talmud*, that * *tho it be full of the moſt palpable Lyes, and contrary to all the Laws of* God, *the Scriptures, and the Light of Nature, yet it is enjoin'd under pain of Death that no one preſume to deny any one thing written therein.*

I have the Teſtimony alſo of two unexceptionable Judges in this matter; I mean the great *Buxtorf*, and our own incomparable *Lightfoot*; than whom none ever better underſtood, nor were more univerſally acquainted with the *Rabbins* and their Writings.

Buxtorf, after he has mention'd all the fine things which can be ſaid to recommend the Uſe and Study of the *Talmud*, adds theſe Words: † *Thus you ſee, Reader, with what Impudence and Impiety,*

† Scaligerana, pag. 218. Qui eſtoit honeſte homme pour un Juif.

‖ Ibid. pag. 218, 219. Raro Judæus aliquis Chriſtianus factus, fuit bonus, ſemper ſunt nequam.

* Gener. 14. Licet plenus eſt inextricabilibus Mendaciis, & contra omnem divinam legem, ſacram Scripturæ ſc. & Naturæ legem conſcriptus, ſub Pœna tamen capitis edictum eſt, nequis neget quicquam eorum quæ in eo dicuntur.

† Abbreviat, &c. pag. 241. Vides, Lector, obſtinatiſſimæ & obcæcatiſſimæ Gentis, de ſuo Talmud & ejus Compilatoribus,

Impiety, this obstinate and blind People extol and magnify their Talmud, *and the Authors of it: And can it seem strange that these neglect the Law of* God, *to follow the Traditions of their Fathers?*

But Dr. *Lightfoot*'s Words are, if possible, fuller yet than any, and may serve for a Compendium of all I have been hitherto saying. ‖ *There are some,* says the Doctor, *who believe the* Holy Bible *was pointed by the Wise Men of* Tiberias. *I do not wonder at the Impudence of the* Jews *who invented the Story; but I wonder at the Credulity of* Christians *who applaud it. Recollect, I beseech you, the Names of the* Rabbins *of* Tiberias, *from the first Situation of the University there, to the Time that it expir'd; and what, at length, do you find, but a kind of Men mad with* Pharisaism, *bewitching with Traditions, and bewitch'd, blind, guileful, doting, they must pardon me if I say magical and monstrous? Men, how unfit, how unable, how fooliſh for the Undertaking so divine! Read over the* Jerusalem *Talmud, and see there how* R. Judah, R. Chaninah, *&c. and the rest of the grand Doctors among the* Rabbins *of* Tiberias *behave themselves; how earnestly they do nothing; how childishly they handle serious matters; how much of Sophistry, Froth, Poison, Smoke, Nothing at all there is in their Disputes! And if you can believe the* Bible *was pointed in such a School, believe also all that the* Talmudists *write.*

4. But above all, this appears from the divine Authority of the Son of God Himself, and his Disciples; who often give us the worst Character

---

pilatoribus, impudentissima & impia Elogia. An ergo mirum, quòd Dei verbum reliquerunt, & patrum Traditiones secuti sunt?

‖ Vol. 2. pag. 73.

of

of the Rabbins and Governors of the *Jews* that 'tis poſſible to conceive. St. *John* calls the *Phariſees*, &c. that came to his Baptiſm, a *Generation of Vipers*, Matth. iii. 7. and our LORD Himſelf ſays of 'em, *chap.* xii. 34. *O Generation of Vipers, how can ye, being evil, ſpeak good things?* and detects ſeveral of their Enormitys in the Woes he pronounces againſt 'em, *Matth.* xxiii. and *chap.* xxi. 31. which repreſents 'em to be worſe than the moſt profligate part of Mankind, and ſuch whoſe Teſtimony wou'd ſignify nothing in any Caſe.

The Protomartyr *Stephen*, Acts vii. 51. ſpeaking to 'em, ſays, *Ye ſtiff-necked —— ye do always reſiſt the* HOLY GHOST, *&c.* But not to multiply Inſtances of this nature, which every body is well acquainted with, I will add but one more, which reaches expreſly the thing in diſpute, and proves their Traditions concerning Waſhings made void the Law. *Mark* vii. 8, &c. *Laying aſide the Commandment of GOD, ye hold the Traditions of Men, as the waſhing of Pots and Cups; and many other ſuch-like things ye do. And he ſaid unto them, Full well ye reject the Commandment of GOD, that ye may keep your own Traditions —— making the Word of GOD of none effect through your Traditions which ye have deliver'd.* And our LORD concludes his Cenſure with theſe Words, *They be blind leaders of the blind*, Matth. xv. 14. All which, if there be any thing ſacred and awful, and that deſerves our moſt ſerious Regard, in our SAVIOUR's Words, muſt at leaſt ſignify, that they are a dangerous ſort of Men, and rather to be ſhun'd than follow'd: For he has expreſly commanded us to *beware of* their *Leven.*

Since then the *Jews* and their Writings are ſo much to be diſtruſted, and are ſo ſcandalous and fallacious, can what they ſay be call'd with any

Prudence, † *the true Basis of Infant-Baptism?* To conclude: What is built upon this Basis, is a Rabbinical Tradition, and one of those Washings which our LORD condemns; but not a Christian Baptism. I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

† Dr. Hammond's *Six Queries*, pag. 195. Margin.

LETTER X.

Arrian, *from whom Mr.* Wall *next argues, too late to determine the Matter. He may perhaps only speak of the Purifications for Pollutions. The* Pagans *frequently confounded the* Jews *and* Christians *together, as appears from* Themistius. *From* Arrian *himself. From* Lucian. *From* Tacitus. *From* Suetonius. *And* Rigaltius *understands* Arrian's *Words so too. As do also* Petavius, Lipsius, *and* Barthius. *Mr.* Wall's *Argument from* Gregory Nazianzen, *examin'd. This Father liv'd too late to determine our Dispute; and does not speak of an initiatory Baptism. The Scripture makes no mention of any initiatory Baptism in use among the* Jews. Exod. xix. 10. *makes nothing to the Purpose.* Maimonides *his Rule of Interpretation, false. The* Rabbins *very bad Interpreters.* Sanctify *does not necessarily imply washing. Nothing in the Words which so much as intimates the Body was to be wash'd. There is no mention of an initiatory*

Baptiſm in any authentic antient Hiſtory: Even tho they had the faireſt Occaſions, and ought not to have omitted it, if there had been any ſuch uſage. This illuſtrated by ſome Inſtances from Joſephus *and* Ganz. *'Tis on many Accounts very improbable that the* Jews *had any ſuch Ceremony. Prov'd from St.* Paul's *Words. From* Gregory Nazianzen. *From St.* Peter. *Several Authors of Reputation, and eſpecially the Antients, do in effect deny they knew of any initiatory Baptiſm among the* Jews. *Thus St.* Barnabas. Juſtin Martyr. Tertullian. Origen. *St.* Cyril *of* Jeruſalem. *Many Writers ſay our Baptiſm came inſtead (not of Baptiſm among the* Jews, *but) of Sacrifices; as the* Recognitions. *Or of the waſhings for Pollutions, as the* Apoſtolical Conſtitutions *pretend. And Mr.* Hill *ſpeaks to the purpoſe. Others more commonly ſay, it ſucceeds in the place of Circumciſion. The Concluſion from theſe Obſervations. Tho the* Jews *cou'd be prov'd to have baptiz'd their Proſelytes, this does no ſervice to the Cauſe of Pædobaptiſm. For,* 1. *It does not appear that Infants were ſo admitted.* 2. *If the* Jews *had ſuch a Baptiſm as is pretended, it is no Rule to Chriſtians: otherwiſe the* Socinians, *&c. have a good handle to lay aſide the Uſe of Baptiſm. And there is no manner of Analogy between the pretended* Jewiſh *and the* Chriſtian *Pædobaptiſm.* 3. *We need not go back to the Baptiſm of St.* John; *which there is more reaſon to think was the Pattern of* Christ's *than a* Jewiſh *Ceremony. St.* John, Christ *and his Apoſtles baptiz'd no Infants. A Paſſage of* Joſephus *to this purpoſe. Another from* Origen. *Another of St.* Peter. 4. *At beſt this ſuppos'd Baptiſm of the* Jews *is only a Traditionary Ceremony from the* Rabbins. *Their quoting Texts for it no proof of its divine Inſtitution. The* Rabbins *don't pretend to find an initiatory Baptiſm*

tism in the Scriptures. But confess it is only a Tradition of their Elders. This prov'd from the Words of the Talmud. *Which are explain'd by some Rules of* Maimonides. Exod. xix. 10. *cited only by way of Accommodation. 'Tis therefore great Presumption to draw a* Rabbinical *Tradition into a Precedent for the Christian Church. These things apply'd to the present Dispute. The Conclusion.*

SIR,

HAving shewn that the Citations from the *Jewish* Writers prove nothing at all, and do our Adversarys no service: I proceed now to Mr. *Wall*'s other Arguments which are brought to prove, that the *Jews* before, and at our SAVIOUR's time, were wont to initiate Proselytes and their Children by Baptism.

He insists upon some Words of *Arrian* the Philosopher of *Nicomedia*.

1. But first, This Philosopher liv'd not till about 150 Years after CHRIST †, and therefore at best will not prove that Custom to have been more antient: for he only speaks of his own time, without any reference to the past.

2. Or secondly, He may, for what appears to the contrary, allude not to any initiatory Washing, but to the frequent Purifications for legal Pollutions: and the *Hemerobaptistæ*, or, as *Justin Martyr* ‖ calls 'em, the Βαπτισταὶ, have their Denomination from this, and from their teaching, says the *Renunciation* cited by *Cotelerius* *, *That no Man cou'd be sav'd unless he was wash'd daily*; and

† Euseb. Chronic. pag. 213.

‖ Dialog. cum Tryph. pag. 307.

* Codic. Regio 1818. ad Recognit. Clement. p. 499. b. Μὴ δύνασθαι Ἄνθρωπον σωθῆναι, ἐὰν μὴ καθ' ἑκάστην Ἡμέραν βαπτίζεσθαι.

not becauſe they were daily initiated. And *Euſebius* * tells us, from *Hegeſippus*, that one Sect of the *Jews*, who were very zealous for theſe Waſhings, were call'd peculiarly by his Name. It may ſeem more probable too that *Arrian* alludes to this Sect, and theſe Waſhings, if we call to mind that Rule of the *Talmud* mention'd by Dr. *Lightfoot*, if I remember well †, *That a Woman baptiz'd or waſh'd, tho for Uncleanneſs only, does nevertheleſs thereby become a compleat Proſelyteſs or* Jeweſs. The *Talmud* it ſelf therefore determines, that waſhing for Uncleanneſs does conſtitute a compleat *Jew*; which is the utmoſt that *Arrian* ſays: and therefore 'tis not neceſſary to underſtand him of any other waſhing. But,

3. 'Twas common for the *Pagan* Writers to confound the *Jews* and *Chriſtians* together: for CHRIST himſelf and his Apoſtles being *Jews* by Birth, and ſent primarily to preach to that People, and the firſt Churches conſiſting of *Jews* for the moſt part, the Heathen who were not well enough acquainted with theſe things, might eaſily ſuppoſe the Chriſtians were only a Sect of the *Jews*, that made a Separation from their antient Governours upon account of ſome particular Opinions among themſelves. *Feſtus* plainly takes it ſo when he tells King *Agrippa*, that *Paul*'s Accuſers *had only certain Queſtions againſt him of their own Superſtition, and of one* JESUS *which was dead, whom* Paul *affirm'd to be alive*, Acts xxv. 19. And elſewhere in the Scriptures the Apoſtles are often ſpoken of as *Jews*: nay, ſometimes the Chriſtians are argu'd to be *Jews*, in the beſt and trueſt Senſe; *He is not a* Jew *which is one outwardly*, &c. *but he*

* Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. 4. cap. 22.
† Jebamoth. fol. 45. b.

is a Jew *which is one inwardly*, Rom. ii. 28. And if ye be CHRIST's, *then are ye* Abraham's *Seed*, &c. *Gal.* iii. 29.

This is apparent also from many Passages in the *Greek* and *Latin* Authors. *Themistius* citing some Words from the *Old Testament*, calls it, * *the Law of the* Assyrians; and in several other Places † he gives it the same Name. And somewhere, as *Petavius* ‖ notes, he calls it *Syrian*, which will be construʼd nothing less than calling the *Jews*, *Assyrians* and *Syrians*, from the Country they dwelt in; and yet, at another time, by *Syrians*, he means the *Christians*, namely, in his Oration to the Emperour *Jovian*, where he extols the Emperour's Generosity and Justice in permitting every one to follow what Religion he thought best. †† *For*, says he, *the* Syrians *perform Divine Worship in one manner*, *the* Greeks *in another*, *and the* Egyptians *in a way different from both: nay*, *and the* Syrians *themselves do not agree in all things*, *no one believes exactly as his Neighbour*; *but this believes one thing*, *and that another*, &c. Here he manifestly has his Eye upon the Quarrels and Disputes which then disturbʼd the Church of CHRIST, and made too great a Noise not to be observ'd by the Enemys of our Holy Profession; especially by so great a Man as *Themistius*, who artfully improves this Opportunity to insinuate how very uncertain the Christians were in their Belief, thereby to possess the Emperour with an ill Opinion

---

* Orat. 5. pag. 141. Λόγῳ τῷ Ἀσσυρίῳ, &c.

† Orat. 7. Init. & Orat. 9. pag. 201.

‖ Ad Orat. 12. pag. 635.

†† Pag. 282. Ἄλλως Σύρους ἐθέλει πολιτεύεσθαι, ἄλλως Ἕλληνας, ἄλλως Αἰγυπτίους· καὶ ὅδ' αὐτὸς Σύρος ὁμοίως, ἀλλ' ἤδη καταχρώμενος εἰς μικρόν. εἷς γὰρ ὧδε εἰς τῶν πόλεως τὰ αὐτὰ νοσήσειεν ἀκριβῶς, ἀλλ' ὁ μέν, τοδί, ὁδέ, τοδί

of 'em, to whom he was known to be very much inclin'd.

Thus *Themiſtius*, then, by the ſame Word *Syrians*, means both *Jews* and *Chriſtians*, whom he does not ſufficiently diſtinguiſh from one another: for the *Chriſtians* as well as the *Jews* appear'd firſt in *Syria*, and about thoſe Parts of *Aſia*, which were generally counted the chief Nurſery of that Religion: and therefore *Lucian* ſays, * *From the ſeveral Citys in* Aſia, *came ſome who were ſent from the Publick Body of the Chriſtians*, &c. And it is very probable this may be one occaſion of their confounding *Chriſtians* and *Jews* together: therefore *Le Prieur* ſays †, *Every body knows that the Church was at firſt gather'd at* Jeruſalem, *and conſiſted of* Jews; *and from hence it is that in profane Writers, you hardly find any Difference made between* Jews *and* Chriſtians.

Galilee, the Upper and the Lower, was moſtly inhabited by *Jews*, at leaſt one part of it entirely, together with a large Portion of the other call'd *Galilee of the* Gentiles, *Matth.* iv. 15. of which *Strabo* is underſtood to ſay, ‖ *That it was inhabited by a mixture of* Egyptians, Arabians *and* Phœnicians. *Galileans* therefore cou'd at firſt mean only *Jews of Galilee*, or *Galilean Jews*; and accordingly St. *Peter* is by his Speech diſcover'd to be a *Galilean*, *Mark* xiv. 70. that is, a Native *Jew* of *Galilee*: and ſo in that known Blaſphemy of *Julian* the Apoſtate, when dying he cry'd out, ** *GALILEAN THOU haſt conquer'd me*, 'tis the ſame thing as if he had ſaid, *THOU Gali-*

* De Morte Peregrin. pag. 567.
† In Tertullian.
‖ Geograph. Lib. 16. pag. 1103.
** Theodor. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. 3. cap. 25. fol. 320. Νενίκηκας Γαλιλαῖε.

lean

lean Jew; for he means CHRIST who was a *Jew*, and dwelt in *Nazareth* in *Galilee*. For in these and such like Places, the Name seems to signify one sort of the *Jews* in particular, as if they were something different from others who were not of that Country.

I know these Words may sometimes be only us'd to express the Country: as a *Greek* may mean one born or bred in *Greece*; a *Roman*, a Freeman of *Rome*; and a *Turk*, one born in *Turky*. But if they have any reference to the Religion or Profession, or some Quality and Disposition of a Person; then they always mean that Religion, *&c.* which was most famous in that Place at the time: and thus a *Chaldean* signifys an *Astrologer*; a *wild Arab*, a *Robber*; and a *Greek*, in Scripture, is one that practis'd the Idolatrys of *Greece*: and the Word *Jew*, with us, an Instance pretty near the Case in hand, does not always signify one born in *Judea*, or of *Jewish* Parents, but one who professes to live according to the Law of the *Jews*, which doubtless is the Sense Mr. *Wall* gives it in the Passage of *Arrian*: and so does *Galilean* often signify that particular sort of the *Jews*. Thus St. *Paul*, tho born at *Tarsus* in *Cilicia*, and educated at *Jerusalem*, and consequently no *Galilean* by Birth or Habitation, is notwithstanding call'd a *Galilean* by *Lucian* †, signifying, that he was a *Jew* of that Sect who had embrac'd the new Doctrines of Christianity; *Galileans* comprehending originally none but the *Jews*, for they only of that Country adher'd to JESUS.

But then it is wrong, and a confounding of matters, to call the Christians in general by that Name, which shou'd be attributed to none but

† Philopatr. pag. 770.

Jews: *Arrian* therefore, whom Mr. *Wall* argues from in this Caſe, has committed this Miſtake, when he ſays, † that thro a mad ſort of Humour, and the prevalency of a Cuſtom among 'em, the *Galileans* have learnt to deſpiſe the Power and Severity of Magiſtrates. By *Galileans* here, he can't be underſtood to mean any but the Chriſtians, whoſe Courage and Firmneſs of Mind in Perſecution was very well known to their Adverſarys, and was falſly aſcrib'd by them to Perverſneſs and Obſtinacy. As you may ſee the Emperor *Marcus Antoninus* cenſures 'em, when repreſenting a Mind duly prepar'd to live or die in whatever manner one may be call'd to it, he ſays, * *This indifference or willingneſs to ſubmit to one's Lot, ſhou'd ſpring from a diſcreet and well-weigh'd judgment of things; not as 'tis with the Chriſtians, from Stubbornneſs, but from ſerious Conſideration, and a ſerenity of Mind, which may perſuade others to imitate your Example.*

What I cited from *Arrian*, who is Mr. *Wall*'s own Author, ſhews, that he call'd the Chriſtians by a Name which belong'd only to the *Jews*; for I believe Mr. *Wall* can't find a Place where *Galilean* ſignifys any but *Jews*, unleſs it be this of *Arrian*, and ſuch others. It follows then that *Arrian* does confound the *Jews* and *Chriſtians* together; and therefore he may be underſtood to ſpeak of the *Chriſtians* under the Name *Jews*, in the Paſſage Mr. *Wall* refers to; for he may as well

† In Epictet. lib. 4. cap. 7. pag. 400. Εἶτα ὑπὸ μανίας μὲν δύναταί τις ὕπω διαθεθῆναι πρὸς ταῦτα, καὶ ὑπὸ ἔθους οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι.

* Lib. 11. §. 3. Τὸ δὲ ἕτοιμον τοῦτο, ἵνα ἀπὸ ἰδικῆς κρίσεως ἔρχηται, μὴ ψιλὴν παράταξιν, ὡς οἱ Χριστιανοὶ, ἀλλὰ λελογισμένως, καὶ σεμνῶς, καὶ ὥστε καὶ ἄλλον πεῖσαι, ἀτεκταινόητος.

call

call the Christians *Jews* as *Galileans*, since the *Galileans*, as I have often repeated it, and particularly those from whom the *Christians* are call'd so, were only *Jews*.

I think 'tis a very plain Case, that *Lucian* took the *Christians* at least for a Sect of the *Jews*; when speaking of the Impostor he calls *Peregrinus*, he says, * *At which time he learn'd the admir'd Wisdom of the Christians, by conversing with their Priests and Scribes.* What Priests and Scribes were among the *Christians?* *Lucian* mistakes the matter, and thinks the *Christian* Religion was taught by the *Jewish* Priests, *&c.* When *Tacitus* in his Account of the *Jews* says, that † *those who came over to 'em are circumcis'd*; and that among the very first Principles, they are taught *to despise and slight their Parents and Children, and Brethren*; 'tis very probable he alludes to that Passage of our SAVIOUR, *If any Man come unto Me, and hate not his Father and Mother, and Wife and Children, and Brethren and Sisters, he cannot be my Disciple*, Luk. xiv. 26.

But the common Instance cited from *Suetonius*, is, if possible, more plain. *Claudius*, says he, ‖ *expell'd the* Jews *out of* Rome *upon account of the continual Disturbances they made there, by the Instigation of* CHRIST. But CHRIST was the Leader and Head of the *Christians* only, and not of the *Jews*. *Suetonius* therefore, when he said *Jews*, meant, or at least included the *Christians*. And

---

* De Morte Peregrin. p. 565. Ὅτε περ καὶ τὴν θαυμασὴν Σοφίαν τῶν Χρισιανῶν ἐζήλωσε, περὶ τὴν Παλαισίνην πῖς Ἱερεῦσι καὶ Γραμμαλεῦσιν αὐτῶν συγγενόμενος.

† Historiar. lib. 5. prope ab init. Transgressi in morem eorum, idem usurpant: nec quidquam prius imbuuntur quam, *&c.* —— Parentes, Liberos, Fratres, vilia habere.

‖ *In Claud. cap.* 25. Judæos Impulsore CHRESTO assidue tumultuantes Româ expulit.

so

ſo likewiſe in the Paſſage Mr. *Wall*, and before him Dr. *Hammond*, cites from *Arrian*, that Philoſopher may refer only to the *Chriſtians*, notwithſtanding he calls 'em *Jews*. *Rigaltius*, without any manner of Heſitation, underſtands him ſo: * *Even the Stoicks*, ſays he, *knew, That the Faithful*, that is, the Chriſtians, *were made ſuch completely by their Baptiſm: For thus* Arrian *expreſly ſays*, &c. and here he tranſcribes the very Words. The † learned *Petavius* is alſo of this Opinion. ‖ *Lipſius* takes the Place in the ſame Senſe, and compares it with the Words of *Suetonius* above-cited; and ſays, *For who were baptiz'd but the Chriſtians?* And *Barthius* ſays upon it, (*a*) *Baptiſm was not the diſtinguiſhing Sign of a* Jew, *but of a* Chriſtian.

And it's certain, that ſuppoſing the *Jews* did baptize, yet Circumciſion was the great Badg of a *Jew*; and ſo neceſſary, that they are often call'd from it in Scripture, the *Circumciſion* emphatically. *Arrian* therefore cou'd not be well underſtood to ſay, the Proſelytes became complete *Jews* by being baptiz'd, ſince Circumciſion was the more known and eſſential Ceremony with them. (*b*) *Petavius* indeed imagines the Paſſage in *Arrian* is corrupted, and that inſtead of ἡγημένος, we ſhou'd read περιτετμημένος; and ſo makes the Place ſpeak of Baptiſm and Circumciſion too. But the Criticiſm is too bold and licentious, without the Authority of any Copy, and grounded only on *Petavius*'s Fancy;

---

* *In Tertul. de Baptiſmo, p.* 229. *lit.* a. Fideles perfici Baptiſmo. ſciebant etiam Stoici. Sic enim diſertiſſimè Arrianus Epict. 2. 9, *&c.*

† Not. in Themiſt. Orat. 12. p. 635.

‖ Ad Annal. Tacit. lib. 15.

(*a*) Ad Rutilii Itinerarium. Sane Judæi Signaculum non erat baptizatum eſſe, ſed Chriſtiani.

(*b*) Not. ad Themiſt. Orat. 12. p. 635.

and

and therefore I see no reason to admit it. But if by *Jews* he meant Converts to Christianity, who at first were chiefly *Jews*, the Expression is well enough, for they were always receiv'd into the Body of Christians by Baptism: and not before, but after this Ceremony, they were accounted complete Christians; which is all very sutable to *Arrian*'s Words: † *That after Baptism, and the publick Profession, they were accounted, and really were true Jews*, or rather *Christians*. And if this be the Sense of the Passage, then *Arrian* does not prove what our Adversarys cite him for.

The next Argument Mr. *Wall* recurs to, in order to establish the true *Basis of Infant-Baptism*, is a Passage in *Gregory Nazianzen*: where that Father undertakes to reckon up all the various sorts of Baptism he knew of, and considers the Reasons of 'em. ‖ Moses *baptiz'd, but that was in Water only. And before that in the Cloud, and in the Sea. But this was all Typical, as also St.* Paul *understands it. The Sea typify'd the Water; the Cloud the* Spirit; *the Manna in the Wilderness signify'd the Bread of Life; and the Water they there drank, the divine Cup.* John *also baptiz'd, yet not in Water barely as the* Jews *did, but likewise to Repentance*, &c. In the following Words he adds the Baptism of Christ, the Baptism of the Spirit, and the Baptism of Blood. But this part I need not transcribe, because Mr. *Wall* grounds his Argument on the first Words only, which, he thinks, prove that the *Jews* did undoubtedly initiate their Proselytes by Bap-

† Epictet. lib. 2. cap. 9. Ὅταν δ' ἀναλάζῃ τὸ Πάθος τὸ τῆς βεβαμμένης καὶ ἡμιωβίου, τότε καὶ ἔστι πρὸς ὄντι καὶ καλεῖται Ἰουδαῖος.

‖ Orat. 39. p. 634. Ἐβαπτίσατο Μωϋσῆς ἐν Νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν Θαλάσσῃ. τυπικῶς δὲ τοῦτο ἦν ὡς καὶ Παύλῳ δοκεῖ ἡ Θάλασσα τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, &c.

tism,

tiſm, ſince they themſelves were alſo at firſt ſo initiated.

But here I muſt firſt make the common Remark which affects all Mr. *Wall*'s Arguments, namely, That the Authority he uſes is of much too late a Date: for St. *Gregory* liv'd but about the latter end of the 4th Century, which is not early enough to give an infallible Certainty of what was done in CHRIST's Time, and much leſs in that of *Moſes*. Beſides, St. *Gregory* does not ſpeak of an Initiatory Baptiſm; but only of the Legal Waſhings for Uncleanneſs. And this is ſo obvious, that one wou'd wonder how any Man cou'd pretend to underſtand him otherwiſe. For ſince he goes to enumerate all the kinds of Baptiſm; and the *divers Waſhings* mention'd in the Scripture were ſo very notorious, and cou'd not poſſibly be forgot; 'tis unaccountable, how any one can perſuade himſelf that St. *Gregory* wou'd entirely paſs over theſe common Waſhings, which were ſo well known; and ſpeak of ſome other ſtrange Baptiſm not mention'd in Scripture, nor by any Author of Credit.

It can't be fairly deny'd, that the Words may very naturally be underſtood of thoſe Legal Waſhings, and that there is no one Circumſtance in 'em which in the leaſt inſinuates they mean any thing elſe; and therefore 'tis a pitiful begging of the Queſtion, to ſay, they refer to any ſuch Baptiſm as our Adverſarys maintain: on the contrary, I take this and all ſuch Paſſages, to make againſt 'em; for tho St. *Gregory* ſets himſelf to reckon up all the Baptiſms he knew of, and mentions ſeveral, yet he never takes the leaſt notice of a Baptiſm to initiate *Jews* or Proſelytes: which muſt import thus much, *viz.* that St. *Gregory* knew no ſuch initiatory Baptiſm.

And

And now, Sir, I think, I may ſay, theſe are all the Arguments Mr. *Wall* employs to eſtabliſh his Poſition, that the *Jews*, at our SAVIOUR's Time, initiated their Proſelytes by Baptiſm. He cites indeed *Cyprian* and *Baſil*, and might perhaps have added ſeveral others to as much purpoſe; but what they ſay amounts to no more than what was ſaid by St. *Gregory*, and may receive the ſame Anſwer. And from hence 'tis ſufficiently evident, Mr. *Wall* has ſaid nothing which riſes to any probable Proof, that this *main Baſis of Infant-Baptiſm* is true. For I leave you to judg whether every Pretence to this has not been ſufficiently refuted.

To prove Negatives is always difficult, and ſometimes impoſſible; and therefore I might be excus'd from any farther trouble on this Head. However, ſince it may be of uſe to confirm my Notion of this Matter, I will endeavour to make out, as far as it ſhall ſeem needful, theſe following Obſervations.

1. I obſerve, the Scripture makes no mention of any ſuch Baptiſm: and yet one can't tell how to think it ſhou'd be ſilent, if either GOD had appointed the Practice, or if it had been us'd on any other Foundation before thoſe ſacred Books were written; for frequent Occaſions wou'd have offer'd to take notice of this, as well as of ſeveral other Inſtitutions of GOD, or Traditions of their Elders: and without doubt, it wou'd have been touch'd on, had there been any ſuch thing in uſe. Mr. *Wall*, I know, puts us in mind, that the *Rabbins* cite *Exod.* xix. 10. to prove, that the *Jews* themſelves were initiated, upon the giving of the Law, by Baptiſm.

But in anſwer to this, it may be noted, that they did not by this Waſhing enter into Covenant with GOD; for that they had done before by Circum-

Circumciſion, which was the Seal of the Covenant: and therefore the Waſhing here mention'd, was no more an initiatory Baptiſm, than the Waſhings of the Prieſts and Levites preparatory to their ſeveral Miniſtrations, and thoſe appointed for Pollutions, which all Perſons were ſtrictly to perform, before they enter'd the Congregation of the LORD to worſhip. The Sanctification and Waſhing therefore mention'd in the Words refer'd to, ſeem to mean only ſuch kind of Purification as was common in all Caſes of approaching to GOD, and was to be repeated as often as ſuch Approaches were made. Tho indeed ſomething extraordinary might be enjoin'd on this uncommon and wonderful Appearance of GOD, in ſuch amazing Majeſty and Glory.

That the Purification was of this nature only, may ſeem more probable, if we obſerve, that one part of it was to conſiſt in their *not coming at their Wives*, Ver. 15. and the Eaſtern Nations always thought this polluted, and render'd 'em unfit to enter the Temple, as † *Herodotus*, || *Strabo*, *&c.* aſſure us. And *Ahimelech*, when *David* requir'd the Shew-bread of him, makes this Condition, that *the young Men have kept themſelves at leaſt from Women*, 1 Sam. xxi. 4. And more generally it appears from *Gen.* xxxv. 2. that this was but a Purification neceſſary in order to perform any religious Worſhip; for *Jacob* being about to build an Altar to the LORD, orders all his Houſhold to *be clean, and change* their *Garments*: which is exactly the ſame thing with that expreſs'd *Exod.* xix. 10. Of the ſame nature likewiſe is that Obligation laid on the *Iſraelites* by *Moſes* and *Eleazar*, after their deſtroying the *Midianites*, that *whoſoever hath kill'd any Perſon, and*

† Lib. 2. p. 71. || Lib. 16. p. 1081.

whosoever hath touch'd any Slain, shou'd *purify* themselves, *&c.* and *ye shall wash your Cloaths on the seventh Day, and ye shall be clean*, Numb. xxxi. 19, 24. And so *Joshua*, Chap. iii. ver. 5. commands the *Israelites* to sanctify themselves; that is, according to Mr. *Wall*'s Notion of the Word, to wash themselves, *for to morrow the LORD will do Wonders among you*: which implys, these Sanctifications were usual in such extraordinary Cases. And thus among the Heathens, those who came to consult the Oracle of *Trophonius*, were to wash themselves in the River † *Hercyna*. And the Priests at *Delphos* wash'd themselves before they went to the Temple ||.

So that we see this is only a common Purification, always us'd to qualify Persons to appear before GOD; and therefore Mr. *Wall*, or the Rabbins he cites, have no reason to pretend, the Sanctification and Washing mention'd *Exod.* xix. 10. signifys any thing else.

But besides all this, I don't perceive the Necessity of supposing the Words respect the washing of the Body, which is neither expres's'd nor imply'd. As to the Authority of the Rabbins, who, our Author informs us from *Selden*, do generally favour his Fancy; I have already shewn, they are not to be depended on. The Rule *Maimonides* has accommodated our Author with, *That wheresoever in the Law the washing of the Body or Garments is mention'd, it means still the washing of the whole Body*, I think serves but to manifest the Confidence of the Rabbins, and our Author's Credulity. For, without enquiring into the reason of the Rule, Mr. *Wall* takes it solely upon trust, as a Maxim of Interpretation. But, why

† Pausan. lib. 19. p. 603.
|| Eurip. in Jove Vers. 96.

shou'd

ſhou'd the Rules which the Rabbins arbitrarily lay down, be urg'd in oppoſition to the plain Letter and Propriety of the original Text?

The moſt that can be ſaid for theſe Interpreters in the preſent Caſe, is, that they muſt be ſuppos'd to underſtand the Idiom and Phraſes of the *Hebrew* Tongue, and therefore may be qualify'd, by their Obſervations and Knowledg of that kind, to direct us in finding out the Senſe of the Old Teſtament. But the vanity of this Argument in their favour appears by what I have ſaid above. And our great *Engliſh* Rabbin, Dr. *Lightfoot*, was ſo far from entertaining ſuch an Opinion of 'em, that he judg'd 'em unfit to point the Bible, much more to make ſtanding Rules for the Interpretation of it. Without having any regard therefore to theſe Guides, it may eaſily be prov'd, that there is nothing which does import the waſhing of the Body. For,

1. קדשתם is only a general Word, enjoining ſomething to be done thro the whole term of the Time mention'd: and therefore *Munſter* and *Vatablus*, two great Judges, beſides others, ſay, it ſignifys here to *prepare*; as the *Targums* of *Onkelos*, and *Ben Uziel*, likewiſe appear to have underſtood it, by rendring it תזמנון. And why ſhou'd it mean to waſh here, any more than in *Levit.* xxi. 23. or xx. 7. where GOD commands, *Sanctify your ſelves therefore, and be ye holy?* &c. Nay, if it ſhou'd be allow'd to ſignify the *Iſraelites* were to ſanctify themſelves on this great Occaſion, by all the ways in general which they at any time us'd, and conſequently by bathing for Pollutions; yet what has this to do with a ſtanding initiatory Baptiſm? And why muſt a Command on ſo ſingular and extraordinary an Occaſion, be drawn into

into a Precedent, and made a Rule for ordinary Cases? But,

2. Neither does this Washing seem to be intended; because, tho there is particular mention of washing their Clothes, there is none of washing their Bodys too: and yet no Man can imagine why either shou'd be particularly mention'd, if both had been included in the Word *to sanctify*; nor if neither were comprehended in the Word, that the washing of the Body was meant, tho the washing of the Garments only is express'd. For, whence shou'd they gather this? The Word in the *Hebrew* for *wash*, is only proper to washing of Clothes, to which it is apply'd, and can't be us'd to signify the washing of the Body. The washing of the Body can't be included under washing of the Clothes, because these are not only two very different things, but are also as distinctly and particularly express'd, when both are intended. Thus, *Levit.* xv. 5. *Whosoever toucheth his Bed, shall wash his Clothes, and bathe himself in Water*, &c. And again, Ver. 13. *shall number to himself seven Days for his Cleansing, and wash his Clothes, and bathe his Flesh in running Water*, &c. And *Levit.* xiv. 8. 'tis said very distinctly, as of things independent of one another, *He that is to be cleansed, shall wash his Clothes, and shave off his Hair, and wash himself*, &c. and so very frequently elsewhere.

If the Rule of *Maimonides*, that the washing of the Garments means the washing of the Body too, were good, then the washing of the Body wou'd not be so particularly express'd: Whereas you see, Sir, that always when the washing of the Body is intended, 'tis as plainly express'd, and that by a different Word too, *viz.* רחץ, and that even in conjunction with that other washing of the Clothes which is constantly signify'd by כבס.

This is all I think needful to confirm my first Obſervation, *viz.* That the Scripture makes no mention of any Baptiſm whereby the *Jews* and their Proſelytes were initiated.

2. In the next Place I obſerve, That there is no Inſtance or Mention of this Baptiſm, in any other authentick antient Hiſtory. I muſt take this for granted, till ſuch a one is produc'd; and that it has not yet been done, is a great preſumption that none can be found. Nay, it may be prov'd as well as a Negative can be, that there was no ſuch Practice; becauſe in the Accounts of the Proſelytiſm of ſome, when the Hiſtorians had the faireſt Occaſion in the World to take notice of it, they have mention'd Circumciſion, without ſo much as glancing at this pretended Baptiſm. Thus *Joſephus* informs us, that *Hyrcanus*, after having ſubdu'd the *Idumeans*, made and initiated 'em *Jews*, by Circumciſion only; for had any thing elſe been as neceſſary, *Hyrcanus* wou'd have perform'd it, and the judicious Hiſtorian wou'd not have forgot to mention it: But ſince he has not left the leaſt Intimation of it, I reckon we have the double Authority, *viz.* of *Hyrcanus* who was High Prieſt, and of *Joſephus*, on our ſide. The Hiſtorian's own Words run thus: † *Hyrcanus alſo took* Adora *and* Mariſſa; *and having ſubdu'd all* Idumæa, *he gave the Inhabitants leave to continue in that Country, on Condition they wou'd be circumcis'd, and obſerve the Laws and Cuſtoms of the* Jews.

† Antiquit. Judaic. lib. 13. c. 17. p. 450. E. Τχανὸς δὲ καὶ τῆς Ἰδουμαίας αἱρεῖ πόλεις Ἄδωρα, καὶ Μάρισαν. καὶ ἅπαντας τοὺς Ἰδουμαίους ἐπιχειρίους ποιησάμενος, ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς μένειν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ εἰ περιτέμνοιντο τε τὰ αἰδοῖα καὶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις νόμοις χρῆσθαι θέλοιεν. οἱ δὲ πόθῳ τῆς πατρίου γῆς καὶ τῶν περιόντων καὶ τὴν ἄλλην τὸν βίου δίαιταν ὑπέμειναν τὴν αὐτὴν Ἰουδαίοις ποιήσασθαι.

They

They therefore, unwilling to be expell'd their native Country, receiv'd Circumcision, and led their Lives according to the Manner of the Jews, And in another place he tells us, that *Aristobulus*, Son of the above-nam'd *Hyrcanus*, caus'd the *Itureans* to be made Proselytes by Circumcision, and says nothing of Baptism. † *He oblig'd them that wou'd stay in the Land to be circumcis'd, and live according to the Laws and Customs of the* Jews. And *Philo*, another considerable Author, is in like manner wholly silent of this Baptism. To be sure, if there had been any thing in these or such-like Authors, we shou'd have heard of it over and over: but their Silence, even when they are professedly giving an Account of the Customs and Antiquitys of the *Jews*, is a very weighty Consideration, and ought to go a great way toward demonstrating, that no such thing either was, or ought to be practis'd.

An Instance of this nature I remember likewise in *Ganz*, one of the best Historians among the Rabbins: At the Year 3670, he says, *many great and powerful Citys became the Allies* of *Alexander* the Brother of *Aristobulus*, *and were circumcis'd*; and never mentions any other part of the Initiation.

3. But thirdly, I observe, that what our Adversarys pretend, is very improbable, upon several other Accounts. For Instance, when St. *Paul* says, the *Israelites were all baptiz'd unto* Moses *in the Cloud, and in the Sea*; he seems very plainly to intimate, there was no other baptizing unto *Moses*, but this: why else shou'd

† Antiquitat. Judaic. lib. 13. cap. 19. p. 455. G. Ἀναστάσας τε τὺς ἐνοικοῦντας εἰ βέλοιντο μένειν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ περιτέμνεσθαι, καὶ κατὰ τὺς Ἰουδαίων νόμους ζῆν.

he call this the baptizing unto *Moſes?* It wou'd have been much more natural to refer to that more familiar initiatory Baptiſm which our Adverſarys plead for, if the Apoſtles had known of it, than to this figurative one. And then to make this parallel to our Baptiſm, is very improper, if they had us'd another which reſembled ours. The *Fathers* of the *Jews*, then, were baptiz'd unto *Moſes:* but how? If you'll believe the Apoſtle, by being *baptiz'd in the Cloud, and in the Sea.* This was their Baptiſm unto *Moſes*, St. *Paul* ſays; and can our Adverſarys venture to ſay, this was not their Baptiſm, but another?

Gregory Nazianzen, in the very Paſſage cited by Mr. *Wall*, which I tranſcrib'd above ſomething more largely than he had done, without taking notice of any other Baptiſm from whence ours was deriv'd, or to which it might be compar'd, only ſhews how this mention'd by the Apoſtle as the Type, might be explain'd, in theſe Words, *the Sea typify'd the Water, the Cloud the* SPIRIT. Now, his noting no ſuch Likeneſs in any other *Jewiſh* Baptiſm, makes the Paſſage an Argument rather againſt Mr. *Wall*, and implys, that he thought this Baptiſm alone correſponded with ours.

In another place, the Apoſtle *Peter* makes our Baptiſm to be the Antitype of the *Ark in which few were ſav'd by Water*; for ſo we likewiſe are ſav'd by the Water of Baptiſm. But is it not ſtrange the ſacred Writers ſhou'd point out theſe Alluſions, and yet never in the leaſt hint at the antient Ceremony from whence our Baptiſm, 'tis pretended, was immediately borrow'd? Nothing ſurely can look more improbable.

4. Several Authors of Reputation, eſpecially the Antients, do in effect deny they knew of any initiatory Baptiſm among the *Jews*, which was the

the original of ours. This Observation is grounded on abundance of Passages.

The Apostle *Barnabas*, in that Catholick Epistle, (if indeed it be his) whereof we have the greatest part still remaining in the Original, tho he is wholly employ'd about the *Jewish* Rites, *&c.* has not one Word concerning the Baptism our Pædobaptists contend for; which being the same as to Externals with one of our holy Sacraments, cou'd not, had this holy Man known it, have been pass'd by at such a time. Nay more, in one place, he applys himself to find out some *Preludes* of our Christian Baptism; and yet even there, where it wou'd have been so natural and necessary, we meet with no Footsteps of it. † *Let us see*, says he, *whether* GOD *took care to manifest any thing before-hand concerning Water and the Cross.* Who wou'd not expect here to have that Baptism it self mention'd which was the Forerunner and Type of ours, and from whence it was immediately taken, if there had been any such? As a Type of the Cross, he mentions the brazen Serpent in the Wilderness; and does not forget the Posture in which *Moses* stood when the *Israelites* and *Amalekites* were engag'd, *Exod.* xvii. 8, *&c. When he let down his Hands the* Amalekites *prevail'd, and when he held up his Hands* Israel *prevail'd, Ver.* 11. which was to signify, says St. *Barnabas*, ‖ *that except they trust in him, they cannot be sav'd.* I think it can't be doubted, but St. *Barnabas* wou'd have taken the same Method in regard to Baptism, and have mention'd the Original of it among the *Jews*, if he had been acquainted with it;

† Cap. 11. Ζητήσωμεν δὲ εἰ ἠμέλησε τῷ ΚΥΡΙΩ φανερῶσαι περὶ τοῦ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῦ Σταυροῦ.

‖ Cap. 12. Ὅτι δὲ δύνανται σωθῆναι, ἐὰν μὴ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἐλπίσωσι.

whereas he only cites ſome Paſſages of the Prophets, which he applys to Baptiſm, after he had ſaid, ‖ *As for Baptiſm, it is written to the People of* Iſrael, *that they ſhall not receive that Baptiſm which brings to Forgiveneſs of Sins, but ſhall inſtitute to themſelves others.* He means, as *Menard* is of Opinion, their frequent ſuperſtitious Waſhings. And theſe being the only vicarious Baptiſms he ſpeaks of, 'tis probable he knew no other, in whoſe ſtead ours was at firſt inſtituted, and is at preſent continu'd.

Juſtin Martyr, in his long Diſpute with *Trypho* the *Jew*, mentions perhaps all their other Rites, and their Legal Waſhings, but is utterly ſilent as to this initiatory Baptiſm: and there are ſome Paſſages which ſeem to argue he was ignorant of it. In one Place he ſays thus, † *As therefore Circumciſion began in* Abraham, *and the Sabbath and Sacrifices, and Oblations, and Holy Days, were firſt inſtituted by* Moſes, *all which we have prov'd were appointed becauſe of the hardneſs of the People's Hearts: ſo they ought all now to ceaſe according to the Will of the* FATHER, *in him that was born of the Virgin, of the Seed of* Abraham, *of the Tribe of* Judah, *and of*

‖ Cap. 11. Περὶ μὲν τοῦ Βαπτίσματος, γέγραπται ὅτι τοῖς Ἰσραὴλ, πῶς τὸ Βάπτισμα τὸ φέρον εἰς Ἄφεσιν Ἁμαρτιῶν, ἃ μὴ περιδέξωνται· ἀλλ' ἑαυτοῖς οἰκοδομήσουσι.

† Dialog. cum Tryph. pag. 261. B. Ὡς οὖν ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ ἤρξατο ἡ περιτομὴ, καὶ ἀπὸ Μωσέως Σάββατον, καὶ Θυσίαι καὶ Προσφοραὶ καὶ Ἑορταὶ, καὶ ἀπεδείχθη διὰ τὸ σκληροκάρδιον τοῦ Λαοῦ ὑμῶν ταῦτα διατεθῆναι, οὕτως παύσασθαι ἔδει νῦν τῷ τοῦ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ Βουλῇ, εἰς τὸν διὰ τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ Γένους τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Φυλῆς Ἰούδα, καὶ Δαβὶδ Παρθένου γεγενημένον ΥΙΟΝ τοῦ ΘΕΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΝ. Καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ διὰ τοῦτο προσχωρήσαντες τῷ ΘΕΩ, ἃ ταύτῃ τῇ νῦν Σάρκα περιτομὴν δεόμεθα περιτομὴν, ἀλλὰ πνευματικὴν, ἣν Ἐνὼχ καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι ἐφύλαξαν. ἡμεῖς δὲ, διὰ τοῦ Βαπτίσματος αὐτοῦ, ἐπειδὴ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἐγενόμεθα, διὰ τὸ Ἔλεος τὸ τοῦ ΘΕΟΥ, ἐλάβομεν, καὶ πᾶσιν ἔφεστιν ὁμοίως λαμβάνειν.

the

the Stock of David, *even* JESUS CHRIST *the* SON *of* GOD. —— *And we who thro him find access to* GOD, *do not receive the Circumcision of the Flesh, but that Spiritual one which* Enoch *and such like observ'd: and this we receive by Baptism thro the Mercy of* GOD, *and all are permitted to receive it this way.* 'Tis observable here that the Martyr asserts, all the Ceremonials of *Moses* were to end in CHRIST; Baptism it self therefore, if it had been in use before, must have ceas'd likewise under the Gospel: but as this is contrary to the Institution of our LORD, and the universal Knowledg and Practice of the Christian Church, 'tis certain the Holy Martyr had no Notion of any such Baptism.

This seems a little more evident from the last Part of the Words, wherein he opposes our new Circumcision, and our new Way of receiving it, to their Circumcision of the Flesh: and as before he asserted, That began from *Abraham*, and was to end in CHRIST; his Opposition here can't mean less than that our Baptism was a new Thing which began in CHRIST, that is, with His new Dispensation.

In another Place, when the *Jew* acknowledg'd it was not necessary to observe the whole Law at all times, because 'twas impossible, for instance, to kill the Passover when their City and Temple were destroy'd; St. *Justin* puts him upon assigning what was necessary in his Opinion: to which the *Jew* answers, † *To keep Holy the Sabbaths, to be Circumcis'd, to observe the New Moons, and to be baptiz'd or wash'd,* (if he had stop'd here, this wou'd have been thought a great Argument for Mr. *Wall*;

† Pag. 264. C. Κἀκεῖνος, τὸ Σαββατίζειν λέγω, καὶ τὸ περιτέμνεσθαι, καὶ τὰ Ἐμμηνα φυλάσσειν, καὶ τὸ βαπτίζεσθαι ἀφανῶς πάνυ ὧν ἀπηγόρευται ὑπὸ Μωσέως.

but he adds) *when one has touch'd and been defil'd by any of thoſe things* Moſes *has mention'd.* The Baptiſm the *Jew* ſpeaks of here is confin'd by the laſt Words to Purifications for Pollution; and ſince he mentions no other, it muſt be natural to ſuppoſe, he allow'd of no other: for St. *Juſtin* putting him to inſtance in things which might and ought to be obſerv'd, he wou'd certainly have nam'd Baptiſm for Proſelytiſm, if there had been any, as well as Circumciſion, becauſe it was as eaſy to be obſerv'd.

I remember one Paſſage particularly, in *Tertullian*, which is very cogent and plain to ſhew this initiatory Baptiſm is a mere Fable. Even in his time ſome *wicked* People, as he calls 'em, were arriv'd to that degree of Boldneſs as to deny the Neceſſity and Uſefulneſs of Baptiſm, becauſe they found Faith alone had been ſufficient to ſave ſome; and they ſeem to have objected that *Abraham*, &c. were ſav'd by Faith without Baptiſm: to theſe he anſwers, † *Tho Salvation was to be had by a bare Faith before our* LORD's *coming, yet when the Objects of our Faith were multiply'd, and we are to believe in his Birth, and Paſſion, and Reſurrection, then there is an Addition made to the Sacrament, to wit the Seal of Baptiſm, which is the clothing as it were of Faith, which before was bare or naked.* Nothing can be plainer than that *Tertullian* here makes Baptiſm to be a new Ordinance, not us'd till the Chriſtian Diſpenſation; for Baptiſm, he ſays, was *then* inſtituted, when we were

† De Baptiſmo, pag. 229. Fuerit Salus retro per fidem nudam ante DOMINI Paſſionem & Reſurrectionem: at ubi Fides aucta eſt credendi in Nativitatem, Paſſionem, Reſurrectionemque ejus, addita eſt Ampliatio Sacramento, Obſignatio Baptiſmi, Veſtimentum quodammodo Fidei, quæ retro erat nuda.

to

to believe in CHRIST: and till then *Faith was naked* and not cover'd with this Clothing, that is, they were to believe, but were not baptiz'd. Several other Passages might be added from this Father, as where he opposes the Christian Baptism to the *Jewish* Washings for Pollution, not for Initiation *. But this one is so clear that it may serve for all.

Origen also is very plain; for speaking of the Notion of the *Pharisees*, that none cou'd baptize beside CHRIST, or *Elias*, or *that Prophet*, he says in opposition to *Heracleon*, who had allow'd it, † *That he cannot prove any Prophet did ever baptize*, neither *Moses*, nor any after him till *John*, whom the *Pharisees* reprov'd: from whence it seems evident that *Origen* did not know of any initiatory Baptism among the *Jews*.

To these I add an illustrious Instance from the Writings of St. *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* ‖; who answering this Question, Why the Grace was communicated by Water rather than by any thing else? observes, that the SPIRIT mov'd upon the Face of the Waters, *Gen.* i. 2. That the coming out of *Egypt* was thro the Sea, *Exod.* xiv. 21. That *Aaron* was first wash'd, and afterwards install'd High Priest, *Exod.* xxix. 4. That the Brazen Laver which was to be plac'd between the Tabernacle and the Altar, *Exod.* xxix. 18. was a Symbol of Baptism: but he never gives the least Intimation of any initiatory Baptism which gave

---

* De Baptismo, pag. 230. Ceterum Israel Judæus quotidie lavat, quia quotidie inquinatur. Quod ne in nobis quoque factitaretur propterea de uno Lavacro definitum est, &c.

† Comment. in Joan. pag. 117. B. Οὐ γὰρ ἔχει δεῖξαί τινα τῶν Προφητῶν Βαπτίσαντα.

‖ Catechetic. 3. pag. 17.

rise

riſe to it, tho he had ſo fair an occaſion to mention it, if ſuch a Rite had been in uſe. Were the ſame Queſtion propos'd to Mr. *Wall*, inſtead of mentioning all thoſe other things, we may be ſure he wou'd anſwer directly, that it having been a Ceremony with the *Jews* from the time of *Moſes* to initiate all Perſons by Baptiſm, CHRIST was willing to continue the ſame Mode of Initiation in his Church; and if our Author's Suppoſition were true, this wou'd have been the proper Anſwer to the Queſtion: nor is it to be imagin'd that St. *Cyril* wou'd have omitted it had he known or believ'd ſuch a Baptiſm. On the contrary, the following Words ſeem to give us very ſtrong Preſumptions to think he dated the beginning of that Ceremony from St. *John* only.

Beſides, it is ſaid to come inſtead (not of a *Jewiſh* Initiation, but) of ſeveral other things; which is not at all conſiſtent with its being borrow'd from the *Jewiſh* Initiation, for then it cou'd only be ſaid to ſucceed that. The Author of the *Recognitions* ſays, it was at firſt inſtituted, at the Ceſſation of Sacrifices, in their ſtead; his Words are, ‖ *Leſt they ſhou'd think when Sacrifices were ceas'd, there cou'd be no more Remiſſion of Sins, he inſtituted a Baptiſm by Water, in which, by calling on his Name, they ſhou'd be abſolv'd from all their Sins.*

There is likewiſe a very remarkable Paſſage in the *Conſtitutions*, where the Chriſtian Baptiſm is ſaid to be inſtead of a *Jewiſh*: and if the following Explication had not been added, this Place, no doubt, wou'd have been frequently

‖ Lib. 1. cap. 39. Et ne fortè putarent, ceſſantibus Hoſtiis, Remiſſionem ſibi non fieri Peccatorum, Baptiſma eis per Aquam ſtatuit; in quo ab omnibus Peccatis, invocato ejus nomine, ſolverentur.

turn'd

turn'd upon us; but these Words have secur'd it on our side: ‖ *Baptism, Sacrifice, the Priesthood, and their Local Worship he has chang'd; and instead of the daily Washings under the Law, he has given us one only Baptism into his Death,* &c.

Mr. *Hill, a Presbyter of the Diocese of* Bath *and* Wells, if he be of any Authority with you, asserts the same thing: † *For to the* Levitical *Washings answers our Baptism; to their Sacrifices, the Sacrifice of* CHRIST, &c. And those who say it succeeds in the Christian Church in the place of Circumcision in the *Jewish*, by this virtually confess the *Jews* had no such Baptism; for if there was such a Rite among 'em, and our LORD took this Ordinance from it, they ought to say our Baptism succeeds to that, and not to Circumcision. These same Persons 'tis true, at other times, derive it from the *Jewish* Baptism too; which plainly discovers their great Prejudices and Partiality, and how inconsistent they are with themselves.

But as to the Fathers, they seem in general never to have given into such an Opinion, nor afforded our Author the least Intimation to build upon. I know they mention Baptism unto *Moses*, and *Jewish* Baptism; but in these Places, as you have in some degree seen, they always mean the Baptism of the Cloud and the Sea, or some such typical one, or else the *Jewish* Washings for Purification: this must be very plain to any

---

‖ Lib. 6. cap. 23. Τὸ Βάπτισμα, τὸν Θυσίαν, τὸν Ἱερωσύνην, τὸν τοπικὸν Λατρείαν, ἔτεροις μετεποίησεν ἀντὶ μὲν καθημερινῶν, ἓν μόνον δὸς Βάπτισμα, τὸ εἰς τὸν Αὐτοῦ Θάνατον, &c.

† Differt. de Presbyteratu, Lib. 4. cap. 3. §. 3. Siquidem Lotionibus Leviticis nostrum Lavacrum, istorum Sacrificiis CHRISTI Victima—— ex adverso respondent.

honest

honeſt Reader of their Writings, and therefore I think it the leſs needful to inſiſt more upon it.

Now to draw up the Force and Concluſion of theſe Obſervations in ſhort. If, as I have made out to you, there is no Command in Scripture, nor Inſtance in that nor any other authentick Writing, of the Chriſtian Baptiſm's being deriv'd from the *Jews*, but ſeveral conſiderable Authors do, in effect, deny it, and place it in the ſtead, not of a *Jewiſh* initiatory Baptiſm, but of ſomething elſe: and if none of the more antient Writers in their Diſcourſes on the *Jewiſh* Ceremonys do ever once mention this Baptiſm of Proſelytes, nor when treating expreſly on the Chriſtian Sacrament ever intimate they thought it was deriv'd from any ſuch Original; then all this, I think, muſt prove as fully as a Negative can be prov'd, that there was no ſuch Practice among the *Jews*, ſo antiently as is pretended.

And if, after all, any ſhou'd continue to believe or aſſert the *Jews* did, from *Moſes* to our SAVIOUR's time, and ſo down, receive their Proſelytes by Baptiſm, notwithſtanding what I have urg'd to the contrary, yet on ſeveral other Accounts, there is a great deal of Reaſon to ſay, this Cuſtom of the *Jews*, tho ever ſo true, can do no ſervice to the Cauſe of Pædobaptiſm. For,

1. It does not in the leaſt appear, that Infants were ſo admitted; and Mr. *Wall* does not offer the leaſt Colour of an Argument to make it probable, but only cites a Paſſage or two from the *Rabbins*, whoſe Authority I have prov'd to be of no great weight. But,

2. Even ſuppoſing Proſelytes and their Infants were uſually initiated by Baptiſm; will it therefore follow the Chriſtian Baptiſm muſt be exactly the ſame, and adminiſtred to the ſame Per-

Persons? by no means. How dangerous and pernicious this Consequence is, appears from the handle it gives the *Socinians*, *Quakers* and *Libertines*, to explode the Use of this Sacrament altogether among the Offspring of Christian Parents. For if the *Jewish* Method in their suppos'd Baptism must be the Rule of ours, then none are to be baptiz'd but those who turn from a different Religion to the Christian: the first Converts and their Children born before their Baptism, are to be baptiz'd, but none of their Posterity born after their Baptism; for this, our Author says, was the Practice of the Synagogue, and * *our* SAVIOUR *gave no direction for any Alterations.*

Mr. *Wall* takes notice of † this Difficulty; but I think he says nothing to evade the Force of it, and only notes, that both Sides allow the Necessity of this Sacrament, and therefore we need not concern our selves with this Part of the pretended *Jewish* Custom. But by Mr. *Wall*'s leave, it does affect the Dispute between us; for 'tis a common Rule of Disputation, *That which proves too much, proves nothing at all.* And if a necessary Consequence of more than is true, follows from any Premises, 'tis a certain sign those Premises are not true; and if not true, they are to be rejected. This now is the Case of the Particular before us. For if the *Jewish* Baptism was never administred to any but the first Converts, and must be the Rule to us of our Practice; then we must not baptize those who are born of Christian Parents, neither Infants nor Adult.

So that the Premises upon which our Adversarys build, and which they call the *main Basis of Infant-Baptism*, tend to throw this Sacrament out of the Church; which is undoubtedly a very

* Introd. pag. 17. † Ibid.

wild

wild and erroneous Extreme. For in ſhort, let the *Socinians* and others ſay what they pleaſe, the Scriptures aſſure us, Baptiſm was inſtituted by CHRIST, and was, and ought to be adminiſtred *for the Forgiveneſs of Sins*; and therefore Men ought to be very careful how they neglect that Ordinance. And ſince the Pædobaptiſts acknowledg this, they ought in Prudence, and for the Honour of GOD, and of his Sacraments, to lay aſide thoſe Principles which are ſo deſtructive of the Chriſtian Oeconomy.

Beſides, according to the Principles of the Pædobaptiſts themſelves, there is no manner of Analogy between this pretended *Jewiſh* and the Chriſtian Pædobaptiſm: for the *Jews*, they ſuppoſe, baptiz'd the Parents together with the Infants born to 'em, before their actual Proſelytiſm; but on the contrary, thoſe born to Chriſtian Parents before their Converſion to Chriſtianity, are accounted an unholy Seed, and not capable of Baptiſm, as Dr. *Whitby* *, and moſt Pædobaptiſts, are of Opinion. And again on the other hand, the *Jews* never baptiz'd the Children born of Proſelytes after their Proſelytiſm †; but on the contrary, the Children of Chriſtian Parents, they pretend, ſhou'd all be baptiz'd, tho born after their Parents Converſion. In both Caſes running directly oppoſite to the Pattern, which they tell us CHRIST ‖ *took as he found it, giving no direction for any Alteration.*

Again, tho the *Jews* ſhou'd be allow'd to have baptiz'd the Infant Children of Proſelytes, it no more follows we muſt do ſo too, than that we ought to admit 'em to the other Sacrament, becauſe the *Jews* caus'd their Infant Children to

* Annot. in 1 Cor. vii. 14.
† Wall's Introd. pag. 12.
‖ Ibid. pag. 17. med.

eat

eat of the Paschal Lamb; which is suppos'd to be a Type of CHRIST, and of the Supper he instituted or borrow'd from thence: nay it wou'd follow more strongly, that since Infants were admitted to the Shadow or Type, they shou'd now also be admitted to the Antitype, which however our Antagonists will not pretend.

3. In the third Place, whatever might be the Practice of the *Jews*, we need only go back to St. *John*'s Baptism, which there is more Reason to think was the Pattern of CHRIST's than a *Jewish* Ceremony, because he was our SAVIOUR's immediate Forerunner. And this our Author confesses when he says, * *The Baptism indeed of the Nations by the Apostles ought to be regulated by the Practice of* John *and* CHRIST *himself,— rather than by any preceding Custom of the* Jewish *Nation, if we had any good ground to believe that they did in the Case of Infants differ or alter any thing from the usual way.*

If the Practice then of St. *John* and CHRIST himself is sufficient, and the best Rule we can go by, as far as it is plain, let us for the future allow no Inventions of the *Jews* to be made an Argument in the Controversy; for the Practice of St. *John* and our LORD is abundantly plain from much better than *Rabbinical* Authority. The Sense of the Commission CHRIST gave his Disciples, *Matth.* xxviii. 19. I have already prov'd does effectually exclude Infants; and what St. *John* acted is manifest, if we dare trust St. *Matthew*'s Account of the Matter, who tells us indeed, that *John* baptiz'd *Jerusalem* and *all* Judea, *and all the Region round about* Jordan, but at the same time assures us, that as many as he baptiz'd *confess'd their Sins*, *Matth.* iii. 5, 6. And therefore, as we can't

* Introd. pag. 18.

say

ſay ſome confeſs'd their Sins, in that Evangelical Senſe, and yet were not baptiz'd; ſo neither may any pretend ſome were baptiz'd, who yet did not and cou'd not confeſs their Sins. For your farther Satisfaction, you may look back to what is ſaid about this in a former Letter.

Euſebius tranſcribes a Paſſage from *Joſephus* very clear to this purpoſe, wherein the Hiſtorian ſays thus of St. *John*, and his Practice in relation to Baptiſm: * *He was a good Man, and perſuaded the* Jews *to Righteouſneſs, commanding them to deal juſtly with one another, and piouſly towards* GOD, *and ſo come to Baptiſm. For Baptiſm wou'd be acceptable to Him, when us'd, not for purging away ſome particular Offences, but for purifying the Body in general, the Soul being before purify'd by Righteouſneſs.* *Joſephus* in theſe Words, and *Euſebius* by tranſcribing them, do both aſſure us, this was St. *John*'s Method. And, by the way, give me leave to obſerve, that St. *John*'s initiatory Baptiſm is here remarkably oppos'd to the *Jewiſh* Waſhings *for particular Offences*, viz. their legal Uncleanneſſes: which is as much as to ſay, the Baptiſm of St. *John* was a new thing, and not like the other Baptiſms in uſe among 'em, that were adminiſter'd *for particular Offences* only; whereas his was at once to purge from all.

As to St. *John*'s Practice, *Origen*, one of the moſt learned of the Antients, ſays expreſly on the Paſ-

* Hiſt. Euſeb. lib. 1. cap. 11. Ἀγαθὸν Ἄνδρα καὶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις κελεύοντα Ἀρετὴν ἐπασκοῦσαι, καὶ τὰ πρὸς ἀλλήλους Δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ πρὸς τὸ ΘΕΟ'Ν Εὐσεβείᾳ χρωμένους, Βαπτισμῷ συνιέναι. οὕτω γὰρ δὴ καὶ τὴν Βάπτισιν, ἀποδεκτὴν Αὐτῷ φανεῖσθαι, μὴ ἐπὶ τινῶν Ἁμαρτάδων παραιτήσει χρωμένων, ἀλλ' ἐφ' Ἁγνείᾳ τοῦ Σώματος, ἅτε δὴ καὶ τῆς Ψυχῆς Δικαιοσύνῃ προεκκαθαιρομένης.

ſage:

ſage: † *We ought neceſſarily to obſerve, that both St.* Matthew *and St.* Mark *ſay, that upon* confeſſing their Sins, all *Jeruſalem*, and all *Judea*, and all the Region round about *Jordan*, *or all the Country of* Judea, *and all the Inhabitants of* Jeruſalem, *were baptiz'd. But St.* Matthew *brings in the* Phariſees *and* Sadduces *coming to be baptiz'd, but not confeſſing their Sins; and for this reaſon they are call'd a* Generation of Vipers. ‖ And a little after, he adds, ‖ *The* Phariſees *and* Sadduces *were different from thoſe who confeſs'd their Sins.* Plainly intimating, that all thoſe who were before ſaid to be baptiz'd, were alſo ſaid to confeſs their Sins.

Beſides, St. *John*'s Baptiſm was the Baptiſm of Repentance; ſo St. *Paul* teaches the *Epheſians*, Acts xix. 4. *John verily baptiz'd with the Baptiſm of Repentance*; and therefore St. *John* himſelf refuſes to baptize the *Phariſees*, &c. directing 'em to *bring forth Fruits meet for Repentance*, Mat. iii. 8. Now, that can never be a Baptiſm of Repentance which is given to thoſe who don't repent. St. *John* therefore cou'd no more adminiſter this Baptiſm to Infants who cou'd not, than to the *Phariſees* who wou'd not repent. If you conſider this impartially, Sir, I am perſuaded you will ſee reaſon to believe St. *John* baptiz'd only Adult Perſons: from whence it will follow, that ſince his

† In Johan. pag. 118. D. Ἐπὶ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἀναγκαῖον ἡμᾶς ἐπιστῆσαι, ὅτι ἀμφότεροι μὲν, ὅ τε Ματθαῖος, καὶ ὁ Μάρκος ἐξομολογουμένους τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν φασι βαπτίζεσθαι, πᾶσαν Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν Περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, ἢ πᾶσαν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν χώραν, καὶ τοὺς Ἱεροσολυμίτας πάντας· ὁ δὲ Ματθαῖος ἐπάγει μὴ ἐρχομένους ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα τῶν Φαρισαίων, καὶ Σαδδουκαίων, ἃ μὴν ἐξομολογουμένους τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν· διὸ περικὸς καὶ τοῦτο εὔλογον εἶναι εἶπεν τὸ ἀπηκοέναι αὐτοὺς Γεννήματα Ἐχιδνῶν.

‖ Pag. 119. D. Ἕτερος ἐστιν παρὰ τοὺς ἐξομολογουμένους τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν.

Practice is allow'd to be our Precedent, we are bound to do the ſame.

4. But in the laſt place, to fix the matter entirely, this Cuſtom of the *Jews* to initiate all Proſelytes and their Children by Baptiſm, allowing the Fact to be ever ſo certain, was at beſt only a traditionary Ceremony from the *Rabbins:* And tho our Author thinks fit to correct * Mr. *Stennett* for ſaying ſo, yet that Gentleman's ſhort Argument, that *no ſuch Initiation is commanded in the Law of* God, will over-bear all he has there ſaid about it.

To ſuppoſe the Tradition of their Elders of any Authority to prove the divine Inſtitution of that Ceremony, is very weak and trifling; and Mr. *Wall* wou'd be far from allowing all the Conſequences of ſuch a Suppoſition.

But he ſays, † *they quoted Texts in the Law of* God *for what they did.* And what then? Is it therefore a divine Inſtitution, becauſe they pretend this or the other Text favours it? And will our Author himſelf acquieſce in all they bring Scripture to vouch? They may cite the whole Bible, tho not a Word in it makes for 'em; and yet, according to Mr. *Wall*, the thing is well enough prov'd, as long as they cite ſo good Authority.

But I am inclin'd to think, the *Jews* were not ſo much out in the Texts they cite, as our Author is in imagining they grounded their Baptiſm of Proſelytes on 'em. I have already ſhewn the Scriptures mention no ſuch Baptiſm of Proſelytes, and that therefore it was only a Tradition: The Rabbins themſelves tacitly confeſs this, in arguing from the legal Waſhings; and expreſly in

* Introd. pag. 28. † Ibid.

that

that very Determination of the Diſpute between *Rab. Eliezar* and *Rab. Joſhua*, which our Antagoniſts conſtantly quote, in theſe Words; * *But the wiſe Men pronounc'd, that till he were both circumcis'd and baptiz'd, he was not a Proſelyte.* For this makes it appear they deriv'd the Practice only from the Authority of their Elders.

That this is a juſt Inference from the Words, cannot be queſtion'd, if we obſerve, that the *Jews* make a common Diſtinction between the Pollutions and Purifications expreſs'd in the Law, and thoſe which are not expreſs'd there, but have their Obligation from the Authority and Conſtitutions of the Rabbins. Thus the great *Maimonides* ſays, † *The Uncleanneſſes I have expounded, are all from the Law, and are therefore call'd Pollutions which depend on the Words of the Law: but there are, beſide theſe, ſeveral other Pollutions, which are decreed to be ſo by the Authority of the Rabbins only; and are therefore call'd Pollutions grounded on the Determinations of the Rabbins.*

In other Paſſages of the ſame Preface, he carefully preſerves this Diſtinction, and frequently notes, that this or the other *Pollution ariſes from the Determinations of the Doctors*; and *this is unclean only becauſe the Scribes have decreed ſo*, &c.

The ſame Obſervation holds good likewiſe in other Caſes beſides this of Pollutions: but I inſtance in this, becauſe it ſeems homogeneal to the matter in diſpute; and in the *Talmud*, you ſee, the Baptiſm or Purification of Proſelytes is bottom'd on the Authority of the wiſe Men: for ſince it's plain the *Jews* have added many things to thoſe determin'd in the Law, and particularly

* Talmud. Jebamoth. cap. 4.
† Præfat. in Seder Taharoth.

in the matter of Waſhings; and ſince we find no Footſteps of any ſuch Baptiſm in the Scriptures, 'tis natural to believe it was inſtituted only by the Rabbins; and that when the *Talmud* attributes it to the wiſe Men, it means ſo.

Maimonides expreſly aſſures us, this is the proper Deſign and Meaning of that Talmudical Phraſe: For ſhewing the Sanction of each Conſtitution in the *Talmud*, he diſtributes 'em into five *Claſſes*. ‖ *The firſt contains thoſe things which were receiv'd from* Moſes, *and have ſome Foundation, and may be concluded from the ſacred Text*, &c. *The ſecond Claſs comprehends thoſe things which are denominated Conſtitutions of* Moſes *from* Sinai, *but cannot be prov'd or collected by any Argument from the Scriptures*, &c. *The third comprehends thoſe which are drawn from Argumentation only, and which are diſputed; in which caſes, the Opinion of the Majority takes place*, &c.— And theſe things, he ſays, are known in the *Talmud* by theſe diſtinguiſhing Phraſes, N. *ſays thus, for this Reaſon*; *and* N. *ſays thus, for this Reaſon.*

But if any one ſhou'd think theſe things, which admit of diſpute, were receiv'd by Tradition from Moſes; *and that the Diſpute aroſe from Forgetfulneſs or Miſtake; ſo that one ſide is right, but the other either miſtook the Senſe, or forgot ſome part, or elſe did not learn of his Doctor all he ought to have learn'd* — *This is very unhandſom, and abſurd; and for want of knowing things, and the Foundations of 'em, mightily detracts from the Reputation of thoſe Men who have deliver'd to us the Traditions. 'Tis therefore altogether falſe, and ariſes from* —— *and their not diſtinguiſhing between thoſe things which are receiv'd by Tradition, and thoſe which are only Inferences from 'em. But whatever elſe thou doubteſt of, lay down this as a certain Rule, That whenever thou findeſt a*

‖ Præfat. in Seder Zeraim.

difference

difference between the Diſciples of Shammai *and the Diſciples of* Hillel —— *neither what one nor the other aſſerts was deriv'd by Tradition from* Moſes, *nor ſpoken from Mount* Sinai.

And therefore ſince R. *Eliezar*, and R. *Joſhua*, do controvert the Baptiſm of Proſelytes, it can't be thought a Tradition from *Moſes*, but only an Inference of the later Rabbins, drawn from ſome other Principles, and not capable of being prov'd from the Scriptures, neither expreſly, nor by conſequence; for this *Maimonides* notes as the Property of the firſt Claſs only.

The fourth Claſs, he ſays, *contains the Decrees and Determinations of the Prophets and wiſe Men —— which they call Conſtitutions. ——That thou ſhalt not eat the Fleſh of a Bird with Milk, is a Conſtitution of our Doctors, to keep Men at a greater Diſtance from Tranſgreſſion; for whereas the Law only prohibited the Fleſh of ſome Beaſts, the wiſe Men, to keep us at a greater diſtance from that which the Law makes unlawful, forbid alſo Birds*, &c. —— And this kind of Conſtitutions, when they are of general uſe, he determines out of the *Talmud*, that even *Elias* himſelf, to whom they refer all things, has not power to alter or aboliſh in any one ſingle Point.

But the *fifth* and laſt *Claſs*, he ſays, is *of thoſe things which may be of uſe to Men, in order to the Obſervation of the Precepts of the Law. —— Of this ſort of Conſtitutions there are very many in the* Talmud *and* Miſchna —— *And ſome are the Conſtitutions of particular wiſe Men; as when 'tis ſaid,* Hillel *determin'd, or our Maſter* Gamaliel *determin'd, or R.* John *the Son of* Zacchæus *determin'd*, &c. —— *Others again are Conſtitutions of the whole Body, as when 'tis ſaid, 'twas agreed in* Uſa; THE WISE MEN PRONOUNC'D; *or 'tis a Conſtitution of the wiſe Men.* And of this nature

exactly is the Caſe of baptizing Proſelytes; for the *Talmud* uſhers in the Tradition thus: *The wiſe Men pronounc'd*, &c.

Hence you ſee, Sir, the Baptiſm of Proſelytes is built on this laſt Authority, which is the loweſt of all. And if *Maimonides* underſtood the Senſe of their own *Talmud*, which I believe no Man ever did better; then the *Talmud* founds this Baptiſm not on the Law, nor on any Tradition from *Moſes*, but only on the Judgments and Determinations of their Rabbins; which reduces the *main Baſis of Infant-Baptiſm* to nothing elſe but a mere Rabbinical Tradition.

They cite indeed *Exod.* xix. 10. as Mr. *Wall* objects; but I have before * ſhewn, it does not prove the thing Mr. *Wall* thinks 'tis cited for. Beſides, it ſeems plainly to have been cited only by way of *Accommodation*, not that they believ'd there was any Argument in it: and this Method was uſual with the *Jews*. For, what Dr. *Pocock* ſays concerning their Cuſtom of waſhing their Hands, is very applicable to the preſent Caſe: † *Tho they endeavour to find ſome Foundation in the Law for this Rite, and refer to thoſe Words*, Lev. xv. 11. (or in our Caſe, *Exod.* xix. 10.) *this is but an inſufficient kind of Proof, and they themſelves confeſs it is only deriv'd from the Authority of their Doctors.*

---

* Pag. 365, *&c.*

† Not. Miſcel. cap. 9. pag. 385. Quamvis enim Ritum iſtum aliquo modo in Lege fundari volunt, & ad verba iſta וירחץ לא שטף במים *& manus ſuas non laverit*, Levit. xv. 11. referant, non eſt hoc tamen aliud quam אסמכתא בעלמא *Probatio minime valida* & שאינו אלא מדרבנן *non aliunde quam a Doctoribus profectum* fatentur, *&c.*

If

If then this be the State of the Caſe; ſuppoſing this Baptiſm had been practis'd in our SAVIOUR's Time, 'tis great Preſumption in our Adverſarys to draw it into a Precedent for the Chriſtian Church, and to corrupt the pure Inſtitutions of CHRIST with the Fancys of the Rabbins: eſpecially after our LORD has ſtrictly caution'd us, as well as his Diſciples, to beware of the Leven of the *Phariſees*.

For it is to be obſerv'd, the Traditions our LORD condemns were ſuch particularly as related to Waſhings: which ſhews, that Corruptions had crept into thoſe things; and therefore 'tis probable, if there was any ſuch Baptiſm, it was introduc'd with theſe Inventions. And our LORD by condemning their Traditions, certainly intended, neither that, nor any part of 'em ſhou'd be continu'd without his particular Injunction; nor wou'd his Diſciples have ventur'd to retain it on any Pretence whatever. And 'tis very ſtrange that any, but eſpecially ſo many learned and judicious Men among the Pædobaptiſts, ſhou'd ſo eaſily perſuade themſelves to follow this unwarrantable Method, notwithſtanding CHRIST ſo clearly diſallows it, and they know at the ſame time what a faithleſs ſort of Men the Rabbins are, on whom they depend.

Thus I have prov'd, from many Conſiderations, that the Arguments of our Adverſarys do not make it appear to have been the Cuſtom of the *Jews* at our SAVIOUR's Time to baptize Proſelytes and their Children. I have alſo added ſeveral Arguments which do with great Probability evince the contrary. I have likewiſe ſhewn, that even ſuppoſing the Fact cou'd be demonſtrated, it is no Rule to us in the Adminiſtration of a Chriſtian Sacrament, as being only a Tradition of their

Elders, and not grounded on Scripture, nor deriv'd from *Moſes*. And this cuts off one great part of the pretended Evidence for Infant-Baptiſm, and effectually everts what they call the *main Baſis* of it. The other kind of Evidence Mr. *Wall* produces, *viz.* the Authority of the Fathers, is next to be conſider'd. In the mean time, I am,

SIR, *&c.*

LETTER

LETTER XI.

What is to be the particular Buſineſs of the following Letters. The Authority of the primitive Fathers more to be valu'd than Daillé, *and ſome others ſuppoſe. 'Twou'd be eaſy to defend the Credit of the Fathers from the Cavils of theſe Men. They were, doubtleſs, faithful in the Relations they were well qualify'd to give of Affairs in their own Churches and Times. And ſo far their Authority is of conſequence. But yet this is not ſufficient to ground Mr.* Wall's *Attempt upon, tho they ſhou'd afford ever ſo many full Citations. They were ſometimes in the Wrong. The two only ways to prove Infant-Baptiſm, are inſufficient, even tho the Arguments our Adverſarys make uſe of be allow'd all the Force they are pretended to have. 'Tis probable, the earlieſt Churches practis'd only what they receiv'd from the Apoſtles. Mr.* Wall *takes no notice of St.* Barnabas, *becauſe he makes againſt Infant-Baptiſm, in ſeveral Places. The Paſſages from St.* Clement *examin'd. Mr.* Wall's *Argument from 'em ſtated. The main Point on which it turns, a groundleſs Miſtake,* viz. *that Baptiſm is neceſſary univerſally to all that ſhall be ſav'd. Baptiſm does not appear to have been deſign'd to waſh away Original Sin. By this ſame Argument, it might as certainly be prov'd, that all the Antipædobaptiſts now are for Infant-Baptiſm. The Paſſages from* Hermas *conſider'd. In the Paſſages cited, this Father ſpeaks only of Adult Perſons.*

ſons. John iii. 5. *conſider'd.* Kingdom of GOD *does not neceſſarily mean the Kingdom of Glory. The Words cannot be taken univerſally.* 'Tis *has no relation to Infants in any place of Scripture. And here relates only to the Subjects of whom our* LORD *ſpeaks. Who are only Adult Perſons who have heard the Word preach'd. As appears,* 1. *Becauſe ſuch only can be expected to comply with the Inſtitution, to whom only it is truly given.* 2. *Becauſe ſuch only can be ſav'd by it, according to St.* Peter. *Whoſe Words the Pædobaptiſts have never yet fairly interpreted. Dr.* Whitby's *Evaſion conſider'd.* 3. *The ſame Form of Speech uſual, when Infants are not included; as they ſeem not to be in this place by our* SAVIOUR's *Words in the Context.* 4. *The Words under conſideration cannot be true of Infants.* 5. *Something in the Words themſelves limits 'em to Adult Perſons. What it is to be born of the* SPIRIT. *Dr.* Whitby's *judicious Obſervations on the Text. Another Paſſage of* Hermas *conſider'd. He only deſcribes Viſions, and therefore is not always to be taken literally. He cannot mean, that Perſons in their ſeparate State were or cou'd be baptiz'd with material Water. He ſays nothing however of Infant-Baptiſm; but rather excludes Infants in this very Paſſage. Beſides, to give up all our Adverſarys can reaſonably deſire here, it wou'd only prove Infants ſhall be baptiz'd in their ſeparate Eſtate after Death, which is nothing to our Diſpute. Another Paſſage of* Hermas. *That Infants are eſteem'd of* GOD, *no Argument they ought to be baptiz'd. This Paſſage makes rather againſt Infant-Baptiſm.* Hermas *ſays ſeveral things inconſiſtent with it.* Matth. XIX. 14. *conſider'd. It has no relation to Baptiſm.* Dr. Whitby's *improvement of the Paſſage examin'd.* 'Tis *probable the Children were brought to be heal'd.*

It

It does not follow from theſe Words, that they are fit to be dedicated to CHRIST *by Baptiſm. The Biſhop of* Salisbury's *Aſſertion noted, and diſprov'd. Concluſion.*

YOU may remember, Sir, that Mr. *Wall* allows there are but two ways to eſtabliſh the Credit and divine Authority of Infant-Baptiſm, *viz.* to aſcertain the Practice of the *Jews* in CHRIST's Time; and of the primitive Church immediately after.

The Practice of the *Jews* in relation to this Point, was the Subject of my laſt Letter: all I have farther to add, is to ſhow, that it does not appear that the Chriſtians of the firſt Ages did practiſe Infant-Baptiſm, and that the Writings of the Fathers of thoſe Times do not countenance it in the leaſt. And when this is done, Mr. *Wall*'s Conceſſion gives up the Cauſe, and the Patrons of Infant-Baptiſm ſhou'd honeſtly renounce their Error, or elſe produce ſome better Arguments on their ſide.

To all that is uſually built on the Credit of the Fathers, ſome take the ſhorteſt way, and anſwer by rejecting their Authority; and *Daillé*, who has obſerv'd no Moderation towards thoſe good Men in another Caſe, has lent ſuch Diſputants a helping Hand to deſtroy their Reputation. It is an ill return for the great Leſſons and Examples of Piety they have given us, and for their having been ſo inſtrumental in tranſmitting to us the knowledg of our moſt holy Religion. And there is yet a greater Evil attends this Method; for all the Abuſes and Affronts put upon the Fathers of the firſt Centurys, do in the end reflect on Chriſtianity it ſelf, which thoſe great Men have handed down, and which therefore muſt needs be, in ſome degree, of but doubtful Authority,

thority, if it depends on inſufficient Teſtimonies.

It wou'd not be difficult to defend the Writings of the Fathers from the Reproaches caſt on 'em by theſe Men, and by *Daillé* their Oracle, notwithſtanding he has taken ſuch Pains in the matter, and puſh'd it with all the vigour he cou'd. But 'tis a nice Subject, and much too copious to be treated here at large. I ſhall therefore only ſay, that in many Caſes, the rejecting the Authority of the Fathers is a very wild Extreme which Men are driven to, only becauſe they have nothing better to ſay for themſelves, and can't brook to ſee their Opinions contradicted in their Writings.

That the Fathers of the firſt Churches were honeſt, faithful Men, and every way capable to acquaint us with the true Poſture of Affairs in their own Churches and Times, and therefore are to be depended on as far as they relate Facts within their proper Cogniſance, muſt be allow'd on all hands; and I don't ſee how their greateſt Enemys can have the Face to deny this: and Mr. *Wall* pretends to make no farther uſe of their Authority in the preſent Diſpute, than to ſhew what was the Opinion or Practice of the Churches where they preſided, and of the Times when they wrote.

However, Mr. *Wall*'s Argument from the Fathers turns upon a Suppoſition which cannot eaſily be granted him; *viz.* That the Primitive Church believ'd and practis'd nothing but what they had receiv'd from the Apoſtles themſelves. For, what can he mean by endeavouring to prove, the Church of the three firſt Centurys practis'd Infant-Baptiſm? unleſs at the ſame time he imagines their Practice a ſufficient Argument of its divine Inſtitution. And if our Author had ventur'd

tur'd to lay down this Principle so formally as I have expres's'd it; every one, tho ever so little acquainted with Ecclesiastical History, wou'd have been able to judg of the weakness of it.

But without any Reflection on the Honour and Fidelity of the Fathers, their Testimonys can't support Infant-Baptism, tho they shou'd afford our Author ever so many and full Citations: for if the Fathers only prove *Fact* in the Church, and not *Right*; and the Church was not wholly pure from Innovations; how does this prove the Baptism of Infants was no Innovation, but an Institution of CHRIST? And yet this is the thing our Author shou'd have done, tho he takes no notice of it.

'Tis irksom to remember the Instances of human Frailty which even the most antient Church was liable to: they were Men subject to like Passions with us, and therefore no wonder they were sometimes in the wrong; and their Zeal for GOD's Honour was not always according to Knowledg: which, tho it might keep 'em from losing the chief thing our LORD had commanded, might however expose 'em to the Inconveniency of superadding several things He never authoriz'd. The Apostles undoubtedly kept close to His Directions in all things, without Deviation either in Defect or Excess; for they had the immediate Assistance, in a most extraordinary manner, of the SPIRIT of GOD: † *But that the Christians of the very next Age made several Additions*, Tertullian *confesses in his Book* De Corona. And *Eusebius* from *Hegesip-*

† *Rigaltius in Cyprian. Epist. 64. pag.* 279. b. At Christianos ævi proximè sequentis addidisse plusçula, fatetur *Tertullianus* libro de Coronâ.

pus,

pus, notes that * *the Church continu'd* all the Apoſtles Times *a pure Virgin undefil'd* —— *But when thoſe holy Men were dead* —— *then Errors began to ariſe thro the Miſtakes of other Teachers.* And therefore in the preſent Diſpute between us and the Pædobaptiſts, tho our Author ſhou'd prove with all imaginable Evidence, that the Churches did, immediately after the Apoſtles, practiſe Infant-Baptiſm; it will be no Proof that Infant-Baptiſm was inſtituted by CHRIST, or practis'd by his Apoſtles; becauſe it remains a very material Queſtion, whether it was deriv'd from them, or only began with ſome other things after their Death? And this Objection our Author has taken no care to guard againſt, tho we may ſuppoſe he cou'd not be ignorant that the Primitive Churches were liable to Innovations, and did actually admit ſeveral.

Tho this might be very juſtly inſiſted on againſt our Adverſarys; yet I will give 'em all the Advantages they can deſire: and therefore I will grant, 'tis however probable, that what all or moſt of the earlieſt Churches practis'd immediately after the Apoſtles Times, had been appointed or practis'd by the Apoſtles themſelves, and was deriv'd from them; for it is hardly to be imagin'd, that any conſiderable Body of thoſe antient Chriſtians, and much leſs that the whole or a great part of the Church ſhou'd ſo ſoon deviate from the Cuſtoms and Injunctions of their venerable Founders, whoſe

* Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. 3. cap. 32. Ὡς ἄρα μέχει τῶν τότε Χρόνων Παρθένῳ καθαρᾷ καὶ ἀδιαφθόρῳ ἔμεινεν ἡ Ἐκκλησία. —— Ὡς δὲ ὁ ἱερὸς τῶν Ἀποστόλων Χορὸς διαφθορᾶν εἴληφε τὸν Βίον Τέλῳ —— τηνικαῦτα δὴ ἀθέου Πλάνης τὴν Ἀρχὴν ἐλάμβανεν ἡ Σύφαρις διὰ τῆς τῶν Ἑτεροδιδασκάλων Ἀπάτης.

Autho-

Authority they held ſo ſacred. And beſides, new Opinions or Practices, we ſee, are uſually introduc'd by degrees, and not at once, nor without Oppoſition: therefore in regard to Baptiſm in particular, a thing of ſuch univerſal Concern, and daily Practice, I allow it to be very probable, that the Primitive Churches kept to the Apoſtles Pattern. But then I deſire it may alſo be conſider'd, that this, tho ever ſo probable, cannot be fairly made equivalent to the Authority of the Scriptures: ſo that if it can be prov'd from the Scriptures to be but likewiſe ſo much as probable, that the Apoſtles did not baptize Infants (which I think I have already ſhewn) that other Probability drawn from the Writings of the Fathers, ought not to be urg'd againſt us. However, I am to ſuppoſe here, (as indeed I verily believe) that the Primitive Church maintain'd, in this Caſe, an exact Conformity to the Practice of the Apoſtles, which, doubtleſs, entirely agreed with CHRIST'S Inſtitution; and I might venture to put the whole matter upon this Iſſue. Nay farther, ſince Mr. *Wall* is deſirous to have it thought * *impoſſible* the Church ſhou'd ſo early be ignorant of, or vary from the Practice of the Apoſtles in ſo notorious an Affair as that of Baptiſm, I will for once grant him that too: So that now the whole Queſtion is reduc'd to this, Whether it can be prov'd from the authentick Pieces of the primitive Fathers, that the Church us'd Infant-Baptiſm in thoſe earlieſt Times? And if this can't be prov'd, then upon our Author's own Principles, that Practice is no where grounded on ſo much as one ſmall Probability. But let us ſee how Mr. *Wall* has acquitted himſelf in his Attempt.

* Part I. pag. 21.

No

No other Reaſon that I know of can be given why he does not begin with St. *Barnabas*, but that inſtead of favouring the Baptiſm of Infants, his Epiſtle contains at leaſt a Paſſage or two utterly inconſiſtent with it; however, had our Author been true to his Promiſe, he ſhou'd no more have omitted theſe Paſſages *againſt*, than any others he thinks *for* his Purpoſe. In one Place St. *Barnabas* explaining what was meant by the Milk and Honey which us'd to be given to the new Baptiz'd, ſays thus, * *Becauſe as the Child is nouriſh'd firſt with Honey, and then with Milk; ſo we being ſtrengthned and kept alive with the Belief of his Promiſes and the Word, ſhall live and have dominion over the Earth.* Which Words neceſſarily ſignify,

1. That the Milk and Honey was given to every one who was Baptiz'd; as might be largely prov'd. And,

2. That the Word of God, and Faith in his Promiſes, were the ſpiritual Food with which all thoſe new born Babes in Chriſtianity were nouriſh'd and fed; from whence it muſt unavoidably follow, that according to St. *Barnabas*, all Perſons who were admitted to Baptiſm in his time were capable of feeding on the Word and Promiſes of God by Faith, and Infants doubtleſs cou'd not be of this number. This he expreſly tells us was the Deſign of thoſe Symbols, and therefore it muſt needs appear very improper and abſurd to uſe the Sign where the Thing ſignify'd cannot take place; and to ſuppoſe St. *Barnabas* guilty of this, is to ſuppoſe him capable of an Abſurdity. The ſame Holy Writer ſpeaking in another Place of all who were Baptiz'd, has

* Cap. 6. Ὅτι πρῶτον τὸ Παιδίον Μέλιτι, εἶτα Γάλακτι ζωοποιεῖται. Οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς τῇ Πίστει τῆς Ἐπαγγελίας καὶ τῷ Λόγῳ ζωοποιούμενοι, ζήσομεν, κληρονομήσοντες τὴν Γῆν.

this

this charitable Aſſertion, † *That we go down into the Water full of Sins and Pollution; but come up again bringing forth Fruit in our Hearts, and having the Fear and Hope which is in* JESUS *in our Spirit.* Tho theſe Words are not to be ſo interpreted that every one who is baptiz'd is infallibly renew'd, yet they can't mean leſs than that it is to be hop'd in charity they all riſe up out of the Water of Baptiſm, having in their Hearts *the Fear and Hope which is in* JESUS. *Barnabas* plainly meant ſo; and therefore ſince Infants are not capable of this, of Conſequence he knew nothing of their Baptiſm, nor thought 'em fit for it.

Mr. *Wall* however does not go about to argue from this Father; but begins his Collection with two Paſſages foreign to this purpoſe in St. *Clement's firſt Epiſtle to the* Corinthians, which according to himſelf, only prove the Infection of *Adam*'s Sin on all his Poſterity. And neither of the Paſſages is plain even to prove this; for, in the firſt, St. *Clement* is exhorting the *Corinthians* to Humility, among other things, from the Examples of *Abraham*, *Job*, and *Moſes*, who, tho ſuch great things were ſaid of 'em, yet ſpoke very meanly of themſelves; but St. *Clement* ſays nothing of Original Sin, nor ſeems to have had the leaſt Thought of it. The other Paſſage, as every one who reads it will ſee, has likewiſe no relation to Original Sin; the Words indeed may be ſtrain'd to that Senſe, but there is no plain mention of it, nor any Circumſtance which makes it neceſſary to underſtand 'em ſo. On the contrary, ſince St. *Cle-*

† Cap. 11. fin. Ὅτι ἡμεῖς καταβαίνομεν εἰς τὸ Ὕδωρ γέμοντες Ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ Ῥύπου, καὶ ἀναβαίνομεν καρποφοροῦντες ἐν τῇ Καρδίᾳ τὸν Φόβον καὶ τὴν Ἐλπίδα εἰς τὸν ΙΗΣΟΥΝ ἔχοντες ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι.

ment ſubjoins this Inference from all he had been ſaying, immediately after the Words Mr. *Wall* has cited; † *Wherefore, having receiv'd all theſe things from Him, we ought on all occaſions to give Him thanks:* we muſt needs think he had not been ſpeaking of Original Sin, for that we can't receive from GOD, who is not the Author of Sin: nor are we bound to give thanks to GOD for it; for this wou'd be great Impiety.

Beſides, ſuppoſing St. *Clement* does ſpeak of Original Sin, what is that to Infant-Baptiſm? The Force of this is altogether inviſible to me, nor can I poſſibly unravel our Author's meaning in it, unleſs it be this: St. *Clement* aſſerts Original Sin is propagated to all the Poſterity of *Adam:* No Man can be ſav'd from it but by CHRIST, and no Man can be ſav'd by CHRIST unleſs he be baptiz'd; therefore none can be ſav'd from Original Sin unleſs they are baptiz'd: but GOD intended all, as well Infants as others, ſhou'd be ſav'd from Original Sin; and therefore GOD deſign'd all, as well Infants as others, ſhou'd be baptiz'd.

I think I have done our Author all the Juſtice in the World, in this Repreſentation of his Argument, which I have ſtated to the beſt Advantage I cou'd, and yet 'tis eaſy to ſee how weak and inconcluſive it is: for the Words he had cited, according to his own pretence, only prove that St. *Clement* believ'd the Notion of Original Sin; but the other Links of the Chain are wholly our Author's.

2. If theſe arbitrary Suppoſitions were all really St. *Clement*'s, they wou'd then only ſhew what

† Cap. 38. fin. Ταῦτα οὖν πάντα ἐξ Αὐτοῦ ἔχοντες, ὀφείλομεν ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς καιροῖς εὐχαριστεῖν Αὐτῷ.

was

was St. *Clement*'s Opinion in this Case: whereas our Author is to show what was the Practice of the Church of that Time, and not the Sentiments of one single Man only; for he himself confesses, * that *the Testimony of any of the Fathers is not so much to be regarded as it speaks their own Sense, as it is for that it gives us an Evidence of what was then believ'd, taught, or practis'd in the Church.*

3. The main Point upon which the whole Argument turns, is nothing but a groundless and uncharitable Error. If none can be sav'd but such as are baptiz'd into CHRIST, then all the *Gentile* World, whose *Ignorance* GOD was pleas'd *to wink at*, must be irrecoverably lost: and it might with as much reason be argu'd, that even all Mankind, from the Creation to CHRIST's Death, for above 4000 Years, without excepting *Adam*, *Enoch*, *Abraham*, *Moses*, *David*, and all the Holy Prophets, must also be for ever lost, for want of Baptism which was not then instituted, as that Children cannot be sav'd without Baptism, which was not instituted for them. So dreadful are the Consequences of that wild Notion, which is directly contrary to the Doctrine of CHRIST himself, who more than once said, *Thy Sins be forgiven thee*, &c. to Persons not baptiz'd. But our Author is guilty of another Mistake, which likewise flows from the former, *viz.* that Baptism is to cleanse from Original Sin, and that Original Sin cannot be forgiven without it. But Baptism, we may answer, was not so much intended for the Remission of Original, as of Actual Sins: for, 1. The Scripture only teaches us to expect the Remission of our Actual Sins upon our Bap-

* Part I. pag. 21.

tiſm. 2. We ſee Infants who are ſprinkled, are as much, and as early inclin'd to Vice; and others, tho ever ſo regularly baptiz'd, are liable to the ſame Inconveniences, entail'd by *Adam*'s Sin on his Poſterity, as well as the reſt of Mankind, tho not in the ſame degree: whereas, had Baptiſm been deſign'd entirely to waſh away the Effects and Conſequences of Original Sin, then all who are baptiz'd ſhou'd be as perfectly free from thoſe things as *Adam* was in Innocence; for what elſe does the Remiſſion of Sin mean, but being clear'd from the Imputation of Guilt, and deliver'd from the Curſe and Puniſhment of it? And ſince we are convinc'd by the Experience of 1700 Years, we muſt either ſay Baptiſm is a vain impotent Ceremony, which GOD forbid! or elſe grant that it was never deſign'd to purge us from all the Conſequences of Original Sin; it being impoſſible at the ſame time both to be abſolutely free from 'em, and to ſuffer 'em.

The Pædobaptiſts are at a loſs to determine what elſe Children ſhou'd be baptiz'd for; who can't be baptiz'd for the Remiſſion of Actual Sins, becauſe they have none: and ſince Baptiſm is for the Remiſſion of ſome Sin, rather than alter their Practice they pretend it muſt be for Original Sin, but I have ſhewn it does not appear to cleanſe from that; and if then Children are not baptiz'd for Actual nor Original Sin, it neceſſarily follows, that they are not to be baptiz'd at all.

There is this farther Abſurdity in the Argument, from the Primitive Church's owning Original Sin: that if, becauſe they believ'd this, it muſt be infer'd they believ'd, that all Perſons, Infants not excepted, were to be baptiz'd, and that they did actually baptize 'em on that ground only; then it may as well follow, that even all the Antipædobaptiſts in *England*, who do alſo firmly

firmly believe and profess the same Notion of Original Sin, do likewise acknowledg and practise the Baptism of Infants too: for it no more follows that St. *Clement*, *&c.* were antiently for Infant-Baptism, than that the Modern Antipædobaptists are so now; since these own the Doctrine of Original Sin as well as the others.

Mr. *Wall* passes, in the next Place, to St. *Hermas*, who maintaining the necessity of Water-Baptism to the Salvation of Believers, uses some Expressions from whence our Author gathers, that he and the Church of that Time practis'd Infant-Baptism. The Force of the first Passage he mentions, depends entirely upon this Sentence, The Tower is represented to be built upon the Water, *because your Life is sav'd, and shall be sav'd by Water.* And from this he wou'd infer, that none of any Age or Condition can be sav'd without Baptism; and if the Church thought so, it can't indeed be doubted, but the Tenderness of the first Christians prevail'd on 'em to baptize their Children: this is Mr. *Wall*'s meaning, tho he has not given it so distinctly. But, 1. It may be noted, here is no plain Intimation in St. *Hermas*, that none cou'd be sav'd who were not baptiz'd, tho he seems to make it necessary in some Cases. 2. He is speaking of building the Church Triumphant out of the Church Militant, which indeed is built on the Water of Baptism; but still he no where supposes, that none can be sav'd who are not Members of the Church Militant on Earth, or that all Ages, any more than all Conditions, are fit to be admitted into Fellowship. 3. The Stones of which he is building the Visionary Fabrick, are only Adult Persons; whence 'tis clear his Words can have no relation to Infants; and therefore, if they were to be fitted into the Structure, it must be by some other means. All the Stones, not

only thoſe which were employ'd in the Building, but which were rejected too, are thus enumerated by him according to their different Kinds: * *Some were bright ſquare Stones; ſome were drawn out of the Deep; others were taken off from the Ground; and of theſe ſome were rejected, and ſome were fitted into the Building; ſome were cut out and caſt at a diſtance from the Tower. There were likewiſe many other Stones lying about the Building, which were not made uſe of; ſome of which were very rough, others were crack'd, others were white and round, not proper for building the Tower. Beſides theſe, I ſaw likewiſe other Stones, which were caſt at a diſtance from the Tower, and fell into the way, but did not continue there, but were roll'd off into a deſart Place. Others fell into the Fire, and were burnt. Others again falling by the Water, endeavour'd to roll into it, but cou'd not.* Now, if in all this Variety, Infants are not comprehended, then I think it muſt be allow'd that what St. *Hermas* ſays of theſe Stones, or the Building they compil'd, cannot be fairly apply'd to Infants. And, if we may judg of his Meaning by his Explication, it is paſt all doubt, that Infants are entirely excluded. For by thoſe bright ſquare Stones laid in the Foundation, he means † *the Apoſtles, and Biſhops, and Doctors, and Miniſters:* By thoſe taken out of the Deep, are ſignify'd ‖ *thoſe who are already fallen aſleep, and have ſuffer'd for the Name of the* LORD. *They which lie on the Ground and are not poliſh'd, are thoſe which* GOD *has approv'd; becauſe they have enter'd the Law of the* LORD, *and directed their way according to his Commandments. But they which are brought, and put into the Building of the Tower, are the young in*

* Lib. 1. Viſ. 3. cap. 2. fin. † Ibid. cap. 5. ‖ Ibid.

Faith,

Faith, and the Faithful. By those that were rejected and laid by the Tower, are represented ** *such as having sinn'd are willing to repent:* By those that are cut out and cast at a distance, are meant * *the Children of Iniquity, who believ'd only hypocritically, and their Wickedness is not departed from 'em.* The rugged Stones, are † *they that have known the Truth, but have not continued in it, nor been join'd to the Saints.* The crack'd Stones, are ‖ *they who keep Discord in their Hearts against one another.* The short Stones, are (*) *they who have believ'd indeed, but still retain much of their Wickedness.* The white and round Stones, are †† *such as have Faith, but have also the Riches of this present World.* The Stones which were roll'd out of the way into desart Places, signify |||| *such as have believ'd, but through doubting have forsaken the true way.* Those which fell into the Fire, are [] *they who have for ever departed from the Living GOD; nor has it any more enter'd into their Hearts to repent, because of their Lusts.* They that cou'd not roll into the Water, are () *such as have heard the Word, and were willing to be baptiz'd in the Name of the LORD; but when they consider'd what Holiness the Truth requir'd, they have drawn back, and walk'd again according to their own wicked Lusts.* Thus it's evident all the Stones, which St. *Hermas* here speaks of, represent only Adult Persons, and particularly such of them as have heard, and believ'd; and therefore, what he says of these, shou'd not be wrested and referr'd to any other.

And as he is only speaking of such Persons as have believ'd or heard the Word preach'd, it must

---

** Ibid. * Ibid. cap. 6. † Ibid. ‖ Ibid. (*) Ibid. †† Ibid. |||| Ibid. cap. 7. [] Ibid. () Ibid.

be to ſuch only he is to be underſtood to make Baptiſm neceſſary. And therefore our Author ſhou'd not have aſſerted from this Place that St. *Hermas* believ'd, * *Baptiſm with Water is appointed the Sacrament of Salvation to ſuch as are ſav'd*, but only *to ſuch as believe or have heard the Word preach'd*. And to ſuch indeed we readily grant Baptiſm is to be adminiſter'd, in order to their Salvation, according to the Terms of the Goſpel: but it will not follow that Infants too ought to be baptiz'd, nor that the Primitive Church thought ſo.

Our Author has as little ground to aſſert, that his Inference will more plainly appear to be agreeable to St. *Hermas*'s meaning, from the next Paſſage he † recites: for what has been already obſerv'd on the other, may be apply'd to this. 'Tis a Viſion much like the former; and the Subſtance and Deſign of it are exactly the ſame, *viz.* under the Emblem of a Tower to repreſent the Building of the Church with ſuch Stones as only ſignify Adult Perſons.

Mr. *Wall* makes two Obſervations on the Words he recites. Firſt, he wou'd from hence fix the Senſe of *John* iii. 5. For St. *Hermas* having ſaid, *Before any one receives the Name of the* SON *of GOD, he is liable to Death; but when he receives the Seal, he is freed from Death, and deliver'd to Life; now that Seal is Water*, &c. and uſing other Expreſſions to ſignify the neceſſity of this Seal to Salvation: Mr. *Wall* undertakes to tell us, either that this Paſſage proves the Words in St. *John* mean, that none can be ſav'd without Baptiſm; or that the Words in St. *John* prove theſe in St. *Hermas* mean ſo. He has left it a little doubtful which he intends; but one he certainly means, or he means nothing: for as to the preſent Controverſy, what

* Part I. pag. 3. † Part I. pag. 3.

wou'd

wou'd it signify to know the Sense of either of those Writers, if it is not suppos'd to affect our Cause? But our Author, we may see, understands both St. *John* and St. *Hermas* to say, that Baptism is necessary to the Salvation of all without Exception; and by comparing the two Passages he must mean, that one proves and confirms this to be the Sense of the other. And by putting us in mind that St. *John* wrote his Gospel after St. *Hermas* had wrote this Book, he seems to import that St. *John* is to be suppos'd to copy those Words from St. *Hermas:* but other People who consider that St. *John* repeats 'em as the Words of CHRIST, who was crucify'd above 35 Years before St. *Hermas* wrote, will believe St. *John* had no respect to this Passage of St. *Hermas*, and only relates what he had *heard and seen with his Eyes*, &c. and therefore the two Places are not the same as Mr. *Wall* wou'd insinuate.

St. *Hermas*'s Expressions can refer only to Adult Persons, to whom the Word may and ought to be preach'd; for upon the necessity he has been speaking of, he says, *for which reason to these also was this Seal preach'd*, &c. Whoever are understood in these Words, he makes Preaching to 'em full as necessary, as their being baptiz'd.

Our SAVIOUR's Words, as recorded by St. *John*, have nothing in 'em which can at all favour the Baptism of Infants; but because Mr. *Wall* here and elsewhere, as well as other Pædobaptists, argues from 'em, I will take this occasion to examine 'em a little.

'Tis very readily allow'd him, that τις here, as Ἄνθρωπος 1 *Cor.* xi. 28. does mean *any one*, or if he please *every one*; and therefore we will render the Original of St. *John* thus, with the utmost Extension, *Except every one be born of Water, and of the* SPIRIT, *he cannot enter the Kingdom of GOD.*

By

By *Kingdom of GOD*, our Author ſuppoſes muſt be meant, * *the Kingdom of Glory hereafter in Heaven*; and backs it with a very indifferent Obſervation of St. *Auſtin*, *viz.* that its being ſaid, *ver.* 3. *cannot ſee the Kingdom of GOD*, inſtead of what is afterwards expreſs'd by *cannot enter*, &c. clearly ſhews the Words do not mean the Church; *for one that is not baptiz'd may* ſee the Church. *It is therefore plainly meant of the Kingdom of Glory.*

But how frivolous and unfair is this? for Mr. *Wall* can't but know, that the Word *ſee* in this, and many ſuch Places, is no more to be underſtood of a *Phyſical* Sight by means of the bodily Eye, than 'tis in *Matt.* v. 8. where 'tis ſaid of the pure in Heart that *they ſhall ſee GOD, whom* † *yet no Man hath ſeen nor can ſee* with bodily Eyes; but it ſhall be in a manner vaſtly more glorious and wonderful, and more ſutable to his infinite Perfections and Nature. The Inſtances of this metaphorical Uſe of the Word are too numerous, to leave our Author any excuſe.

But all the Antients do underſtand by *Kingdom of GOD*, in this Text, *the Kingdom of Glory*, ‖ ſays our Author. Yet this may not be the true Senſe, if they do; for the Antients were fallible, and often gave ſufficient Proof of it by the ſtrange Interpretations they made: their Opinions are not to be urg'd as always true, but only to ſhew us what was the Opinion and Practice of the Times they liv'd in. And our Author does not go about to prove his Aſſertion; but cites, in a ſcornful way, the Right Reverend *Expoſitor of the* 39 *Articles*, as acknowledging the Truth of

---

* Part II. pag. 124.
‖ Part II. pag. 124.
† 1 Tim. vi. 16.

it,

it, tho he attempts to give the Words another turn. But his Lordſhip aſſerts only, *that very early ſome Doctrines aroſe upon Baptiſm, that we cannot be determin'd by. The Words of our* SAVIOUR *to* Nicodemus, *were expounded ſo*, &c. And after Infant-Baptiſm came to ſome head, then indeed this was much inſiſted on; and the Authoritys Mr. *Wall* makes uſe of, in reference to this Text, are I think all too late, and of thoſe Centurys wherein Pædobaptiſm, and many other Abuſes are known to have prevail'd. If he had cited the Writers of the firſt three Centurys, it had been conſiderable; but what is it to me how St. *Auſtin*, *Fulgentius*, *Gregory*, *Driedo*, *Lombard*, *Ales*, and the reſt of the Schoolmen, determine in the matter?

Mr. *Wall* has not offer'd to confute thoſe Words of his Lordſhip, wherein he is pleas'd to let us into the ground of his Senſe of this Text. By *the Kingdom of God*, may well be underſtood the Church or Diſpenſation of the *Meſſias*, when, as his Lordſhip unanſwerably argues, * *that is the Senſe in which the Kingdom of GOD does ſtand, almoſt univerſally through the whole Goſpel.* Now into this Kingdom we allow that Perſons can regularly enter no other way but by Baptiſm. And upon this Senſe of the Phraſe Dr. *Whitby* argues, *that no Man is indeed a Member of* CHRIST's *Kingdom, who is not truly regenerate*: which he ſtrengthens with theſe Words of CHRIST, *John* viii. 31. *If you continue in my Word, then are ye my Diſciples indeed.* But if this Interpretation be true, our Author tells you the Antipædobaptiſts gain nothing by it, † *ſince the only way, at leaſt the only known and ordinary way, to the Kingdom of Glory*

* Pag. 301. † Part II. pag. 125.

is

is by being of CHRIST's *Church.* As if a Perſon had no more to do, but to get into the Church by Baptiſm, and he wou'd be ſafe enough; for no more can be needful to make him ſafe but to get into the *only way.* And, as if a Man, on the other hand, tho ever ſo innocent and exact in all things elſe, cou'd nevertheleſs have no Salvation, only for want of a Ceremony, he is utterly a ſtranger to, or can't attain. I don't know where our Author learn'd this charitable Divinity; for I am ſure neither the Scriptures nor the Light of Nature teach any ſuch dreadful Doctrines.

However, taking his Senſe of the Place, what will our Adverſarys gain by it? no leſs they pretend than the whole matter in diſpute: for then they imagine the Argument will be very plain. The ſtreſs of it lies in the Comprehenſiveneſs of the Particle τὶς, which they ſuppoſe neceſſarily includes all; than which nothing in the World can be more falſe. For τὶς is not an Univerſal, but an Indefinite; and therefore ſhou'd not be underſtood univerſally. But if, becauſe it is Indefinite, it muſt therefore here comprehend *all*, for want of Limitation, then it may as well be ſaid to take in the whole Animal Creation, nay and Towns and Citys too: for we find τὶς ſo far from being appropriated to ſignify the Species of Men only, that 'tis frequently enough us'd for brute Beaſts, and inanimate things: and ſince Mr. *Wall* will doubtleſs exclude them from being intended, for the very ſame Reaſons we ſhall inſiſt upon excluding of Infants.

There is nothing in the Particle τὶς, which neceſſarily determines us to apply theſe Words to Infants. Ἄνθρωπος, 1 *Cor.* xi. 28. is ſynonymous with τὶς *ver.* 34. of the ſame Chapter; and

yet

yet Infants cannot be thought to be included in it there, and there's no more reaſon they ſhou'd in the Place under Conſideration. Again, *Mark* xi. 25. *Forgive if ye have ought againſt* any, &c. and *Chap.* viii. *ver.* 26. *nor tell it to* any *in the Town.* And ſo, as far as I remember, in all other Places of Scripture where it occurs, it plainly has no relation to Infants at all, nor can poſſibly be apply'd to 'em. And therefore, notwithſtanding its Indefinite meaning, there are at leaſt very many Caſes, among which we juſtly place *John* iii. 5. in which the Particle is not capable of ſuch a lax and general Acceptation: nay there are ſeveral Inſtances where it is directly oppos'd to Words of ſo comprehenſive a Senſe. *Thucydides* ſays, that the *Athenians* || *falling on* (τισὶν) *a ſmall Party, not many of the* Syracuſians, *and killing ſome* (τινὰς) *erected a* Trophy, *and return'd back.* And in this ſame Sentence, the Particle is us'd to expreſs but *ſome* of the *few* mention'd before; for they kill'd not all the few they fell on, but *ſome* of them only. And why then ſhou'd any from the Force of this Word argue, that all without Exception muſt be baptiz'd, or they cannot be ſav'd?

If it be ſaid, that tho τὶς does not ſignify all, yet ſince it means *any one*, or *more*, indefinitely, in all ſuch Forms of Speech as this before us, it does not come ſhort of an Univerſal: for the Propoſition here being Negative, it denys *any* can be ſav'd without being baptiz'd; which makes our SAVIOUR's Words amount to this univerſal Negative, that *none but thoſe who are born again can enter into the Kingdom of GOD.*

|| Bell. Peloponneſiac. Lib. 6. cap. 94. Καὶ τῶν Συρακουσίων πεῖλυχόντες τισὶν ὀλίγοις, καὶ ἀπικτείναντές τε τινὰς, καὶ Τρόπαιον στήσαντες ἀνεχώρησαν ὀπὶ τὰς Ναῦς.

To

To this I anſwer, that it proceeds wholly on that falſe Suppoſition, that τις neceſſarily intends *any one* ſo univerſally, as to extend to all Men, Women and Children. I don't know of any one Inſtance where the Particle is ſo us'd: on the contrary I have given ſome, and cou'd eaſily have added many more, where it undoubtedly does not extend ſo far. And yet unleſs it does in *John* iii. 5. they can't infer that our SAVIOUR's Negative affects all of 'em, but only the Subjects ſpoken of in the Place: for, at moſt, 'tis only ſaid, none of thoſe can be ſav'd without Baptiſm; but it can't from thence be concluded that *none* beſide thoſe will be admitted without this Condition.

But, to cut off all manner of Subterfuges, let us conſider a little who are the Subjects of whom CHRIST ſpeaks; for this will be the only way to fix our LORD's Meaning. He ſays, *Except any one*, &c. Any one what? If our LORD ſpeaks of Beings in general, then it means any one Being; if he ſpeaks of Angels, he means any one Angel; if he ſpeaks of Mankind, as our Adverſarys take it, then indeed he means any one of that Species; but if he ſpeaks of Men only, he intends any one Man; if he ſpeaks of Women only, any one Woman; if of Children only, any one Child, *&c.* and if our LORD ſpeaks only of Adult Perſons, who have heard the Word of GOD preach'd, then τις in the Text can mean only *any one ſuch Adult Hearer*. And ſo our SAVIOUR's Meaning might be expreſs'd thus: *Except any one who is come to the Uſe of his Reaſon, and has heard the Word of* GOD *preach'd, be born again of Water and the* SPIRIT, *he cannot enter into the Kingdom of* GOD. And this we aſſert is the only genuine Meaning of our LORD's Words; which we alſo think appears evidently from theſe following Conſiderations. 1. Be-

1. Becauſe ſuch only can be expected to comply with the Inſtitution, which indeed cannot oblige any others; for all Laws oblige thoſe only to whom they are given, and can't be ſaid to be given to thoſe who cannot poſſibly know 'em, which is a direct Contradiction: for to give a Law, is to make it known to thoſe for whom it is deſign'd; and therefore, while they can't know it, the Law is not given to 'em, nor can they be oblig'd by it. Hence *Gratian*; * *Laws are made when they are promulgated.* And thus St. *Paul* argues expreſly, that *thoſe that have ſinned without Law, ſhou'd periſh without Law; but as many as have ſinned in the Law, ſhall be judged by the Law,* Rom. ii. 12. And again, *We know that what things ſoever the Law ſaith, it ſaith to them that are under the Law,* Chap. iii. 19. intimating, that the Law oblig'd the *Jews* only to whom it was known; but not thoſe *Gentiles* who were invincibly ignorant of it. And again, *Chap.* iv. 15. he aſſures us, that every thing is indifferent till prohibited or injoin'd by ſome Law; and therefore, *where no Law is, there is no Tranſgreſſion.* Now as this was argu'd to the *Jews*, to whom the Law was made known, from which the *Gentiles* were excus'd becauſe they cou'd not come at the knowledg of it; ſo in relation to the Law of CHRIST, they, whether Infants or Adult Perſons, who cannot come to the knowledg of it, are not oblig'd to keep it, neither ſhall they be judg'd by it: for the Great Legiſlator Himſelf has ſaid it, *If I had not come and ſpoken unto them, they had not had Sin,* John xv. 22. but to theſe CHRIST never yet *came* nor *ſpoke*. As before CHRIST appear'd, none were bound to believe and live according to his peculiar Doctrines; ſo now they who

* Leges inſtituuntur cum promulgantur.

are

are ignorant, are not oblig'd to do ſo till he is made known to 'em. For the Reaſon is the ſame now, with thoſe who cannot believe in him becauſe they have not heard, as with thoſe who cou'd not then, becauſe he was not come; and in Equity they are full as excuſable. For as St. *Paul* ſays, *Rom.* x. 14. *How ſhall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?*

2. As only they who have heard, and are capable of Underſtanding, can ever be willing to ſubmit themſelves to this Ordinance of Baptiſm, ſo neither can any others be ſav'd by it: for St. *Peter*, purpoſely to obviate this Miſtake of ſuppoſing the bare external Waſhing wou'd ſuffice, tells us, the whole Efficacy of Baptiſm lies in this, that 'tis done in Obedience to our LORD's Will, and as engaging our ſelves to continue in that Obedience: and ſo indeed Baptiſm will undoubtedly *ſave us, not* as it is *the putting away the Filth of the Fleſh, but* as it is *the Anſwer of a good Conſcience toward GOD.* But ſince the ſaving Efficacy does not conſiſt in the external Waſhing, Infants, who are capable only of that, cannot be ſav'd by Baptiſm, nor reap any Benefit by it: and we can't ſuppoſe that CHRIST's Words are contrary to theſe, which yet they muſt be if he meant that no Children cou'd enter into the Kingdom of Heaven unleſs they were baptiz'd; for then it may be ſaid of them, contrary to St. *Peter*, that the external Waſhing does ſave 'em. The Biſhop of *Salisbury* ſpeaks well to this Paſſage, in his *Expoſition of the Articles*, pag. 303.

Theſe Words of St. *Peter* are an impregnable Fortreſs of Antipædobaptiſm; and all the Attempts of our Adverſarys againſt 'em hitherto have been unſucceſsful, and will probably ever be

be ſo. Dr. *Hammond* * trifles upon 'em moſt egregiouſly, and ſuppoſes all grown Perſons ſhou'd receive Baptiſm with a good Conſcience; but Infants may receive it without any Conſcience at all, notwithſtanding this Text makes Conſcience ſo neceſſary to the ſaving Virtue of it.

Dr. *Whitby*, tho directly oppoſing our Argument from the Words, did not think Dr. *Hammond*'s Pretences worth mentioning; but only obſerves, that St. *Paul* ſays as much of Circumciſion as St. *Peter* does here of Baptiſm, *viz.* that *the true Circumciſion before GOD, is not the outward Circumciſion of the Fleſh, but the internal Circumciſion of the Heart and Spirit*, Rom. ii. 29. *But will any one hence argue*, ſays the Doctor, *that the Jewiſh Infants for want of this were not to be admitted into Covenant with GOD by Circumciſion? And yet the Argument is plainly parallel.* But with Submiſſion to the Doctor, I am of Opinion the Caſes are not at all parallel. For the Baptiſm which ſaves is expreſly deſcrib'd and limited to be, 1. *Not the putting away the Filth of the Fleſh:* But, 2. *The Anſwer of a good Conſcience.* Whereas St. *Paul*'s Words do not import that the only Circumciſion which ſav'd was, 1. *Not the Circumciſion of the Fleſh:* But, 2. *The Circumciſion of the Heart and Spirit.* Or however, there is certainly this difference, that St. *Paul* does not ſpeak of Circumciſion while it continu'd in force, as under the Diſpenſation of *Moſes*; but only ſays that now, under this new Diſpenſation of JESUS CHRIST, the only available Circumciſion is that of the Heart: and it will be allow'd that the outward Circumciſion is now of no uſe at all; *for in* JESUS CHRIST *neither Circumciſion avail-*

* *Six Querys*, pag. 198, 199.

eth any thing, nor Uncircumcision, but Faith which worketh by Love, Gal. v. 6. and vi. 15. St. *Paul* therefore is arguing against the Necessity of external Circumcision, and beating down the Partition Wall of a *Jewish* Rite; which cannot be said of St. *Peter* in relation to Baptism. But if the Arguings of the two Apostles are suppos'd to be parallel, then St. *Peter* must be understood to mean, that Persons need not be baptiz'd with the outward Baptism, if they do but *keep the Righteousness* of the Gospel; and to plead for the Useleſness of Baptism, as St. *Paul* does of Circumcision: whereas St. *Paul* does not deny but external Circumcision might in some Cases be sufficient under the Old Law, and therefore Infants were then capable of that Ceremony; tho now under the Gospel which requires Circumcision of the Heart, they are altogether unfit to be admitted to Baptism, because altogether uncapable of that internal Circumcision, or of making that *Answer of a good Conscience*.

3. Another thing from whence it may appear Infants are not intended, is, that this Manner of Speech is usual in Scripture, even when 'tis certain the things said cannot be requir'd of Infants, nor indeed of any but those who have heard the Word preach'd. Thus *John* vi. 53. with the same Solemnity of Asseveration our LORD says, *Verily, verily I say unto you, except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you.* If we understand this of the Sacramental Supper, and take it as extensively as our Adversarys do *John* iii. 5. then it absolutely denys that any who have never received the Communion, whether Infants or others, can be sav'd, or have eternal Life, that is, *enter into the Kingdom* of Glory: or if we expound the Words metaphorically, to signify believing in the

Son

Son of Man (which I think none can doubt to be the Senſe of 'em, after what Dr. *Whitby* has ſaid with his uſual Solidity) 'tis ſtill as certain, by an Interpretation of this Latitude, that none who do not actually believe, can be ſav'd. For as in one Paſſage CHRIST makes it an indiſpenſable Condition of entring into the Kingdom, *to be born again*; ſo here he makes it altogether as indiſpenſable *to eat his Fleſh*, that is, to believe: and both in the ſame Latitude. But ſince all will ſee it reaſonable and neceſſary to except Infants in one Caſe, it is as reaſonable to do ſo in the other.

The ſame may be argu'd from thoſe other Words of our SAVIOUR after his Reſurrection, *Mark* xvi. 16. *He that believeth and is baptiz'd ſhall be ſav'd; but he that believeth not ſhall be damn'd.* If theſe Words muſt be extended to *all*, and apply'd to every one, then no one Perſon, no not any Infant, can be ſav'd without Faith. And this wou'd make the Scriptures contradictory; for according to the Arguing of our Antagoniſts, 'tis declar'd here that no Infant, even tho baptiz'd, can ever be ſav'd, becauſe it is impoſſible for him to underſtand and believe; which is directly oppoſite to their Senſe of *John* iii. 5. If it can be fancy'd that, if Infants are but baptiz'd here, it will be enough, becauſe they may have more compleat Capacitys in the next Life, and then they will believe: I will only anſwer, that the ſame may equally be ſaid of all Mankind, for all will at the Reſurrection believe and own that JESUS is the CHRIST, and undoubtedly they will be very ſorry for their former Infidelity and Diſobedience; but this Belief ſhall then have no other effect, than it has now on the Devils, to make 'em tremble: for the

Faith that is ſaving muſt take place while we are here, and work by Love.

You muſt needs have obſerv'd many Paſſages of this Nature; and it wou'd be endleſs to mention all. There are two I remember in the very ſame Chapter with the Words under Conſideration, which being ſo near may ſerve to ſhew us the Bent of our LORD's Diſcourſe at that time, and to whom it refer'd; for he, who cou'd ſpeak no Contradictions, ſays, *ver.* 18. *He that believeth not is condemn'd already, becauſe he hath not believ'd in the Name of the only-begotten* SON *of GOD.* The Words, *ver.* 5. cannot be thought more extenſive than theſe, and both refer to the ſame Subjects: but if in one place he means that Infants may be ſav'd by Baptiſm, and yet preſently after aſſerts none can be ſav'd without believing in him, tho they are baptiz'd; How can this be made conſiſtent? for this ſecond Condition is what Infants are incapable of. He muſt therefore be underſtood in both places to ſpeak of Perſons capable both of believing and being baptiz'd.

In fine; if we underſtand this and ſuch like Places with due regard to GOD's Juſtice and Equity, we ſhall truly ſay, they relate only to Adult Perſons who have heard the Goſpel preach'd; for ſuch, unleſs they believe and are baptiz'd, cannot be ſav'd. And therefore I muſt confeſs I think thoſe Perſons are greatly to blame, who either oppoſe and aboliſh the Uſe of Baptiſm, or change it for what is not Baptiſm: but GOD, who is merciful, knows their Hearts. And we have great Reaſon to hope, others ſhall be ſav'd without either Faith or Baptiſm. Thoſe who did not know their Maſter's Will when they might have known it, were to be beaten with few ſtripes; thoſe then who cou'd not know it, ſhall doubt-

doubtleſs receive no Stripes at all, becauſe they are, in that reſpect, guilty of no Fault; and none of the damn'd ſhall have that Excuſe, to plead they cou'd not poſſibly eſcape, and are damn'd of Neceſſity, merely for want of Knowledg, which they had not the Means to attain: for this wou'd be a moſt unworthy Reflection on the BEST and KINDEST of BEINGS.

4. Another thing which ſhews Infants are not refer'd to in *John* iii. 5. is, that what is there ſaid cannot be true of them. For as we are ſure the holy Angels, tho not baptiz'd with Water, ſhall enter into the Kingdom; and therefore we ſay the Words do not relate to them: So we may reaſonable ſuppoſe all Infants ſhall, whether baptiz'd or not, enter into the Kingdom of Glory; and therefore the Words under Conſideration cannot relate to them neither. If there be any Mercy in GOD, in Him who is Goodneſs it ſelf, which the greateſt Impiety dares not doubt of; then all Infants, who cou'd never offend him, ſhall aſſuredly be ſav'd. But if this be true, the Senſe our Adverſarys give of the Words under conſideration cannot be true; for then Millions of Infants ſhall not be ſav'd. The only way to avoid ſo uncharitable an Inference, will be to ſay, the Words don't concern Infant-Baptiſm at all. GOD our SAVIOUR cannot ordain ſuch unreaſonable Laws, nor INFINITE MERCY make the Happineſs of any of his Creatures to depend upon Conditions that were impoſſible for 'em to perform. And CHRIST Himſelf, our great Lawgiver and Oracle, has declar'd of Infants in particular, that *of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven*, Mark x. 14. even of unbaptiz'd Infants, for ſuch were thoſe he ſpoke of.

5. In the laſt place: there is ſomething in the Words themſelves which does expreſly limit 'em

only to Adult Perſons; for they require, that the Subjects ſpoken of ſhou'd be *born of the* SPIRIT, as well as of *Water*. Which, not to enter into a long Diſcourſe upon it, certainly means, as the Biſhop of *Salisbury* has expreſs'd it, * *that except he were inwardly changed by a ſecret Power call'd the* SPIRIT, *that ſhou'd transform* his Nature, he cou'd not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. For this Senſe is drawn from plain Paſſages of Scripture. Our LORD Himſelf, even in the next Verſe, explains it, *He that is born of the Fleſh, is Fleſh*; that is, lives after the Motions of the Fleſh: *but he that is born of the* SPIRIT *is* SPIRIT; that is, ſtrives to live according to the Motions of the SPIRIT. So thoſe who receiv'd CHRIST, and believ'd on his Name, are ſaid to be *born, not of Blood, nor of the Will of the Fleſh, nor of the Will of Man, but of GOD*, John i. 13. And again, *Whoſoever is born of GOD, doth not commit Sin*; and 'tis from that very Principle that he *cannot ſin, becauſe he is born of GOD*, 1 *John* iii. 9. And St. *Paul* expounds this matter ſomewhat largely, *Rom.* viii. where he ſufficiently ſhews, that to be *born of the Fleſh*, is to be ſo ſubject to it as to *mind the things of the Fleſh*; and to be *born of the SPIRIT*, is to be fill'd with ſuch holy Principles and Inclinations, as to *mind the things of the SPIRIT.*

If then to be born of the SPIRIT ſignifys to be ſo influenc'd and wrought upon as to mind the things of the SPIRIT, or live after the Motions of the SPIRIT, as all judicious Divines and Criticks, *Scaliger*, *Grotius*, *Le Clerc*, &c. and even Dr. *Hammond* too, will allow; and Infants cannot poſſibly be ſo born of the SPIRIT:

† Article 27. pag. 301.

then

then that Text which requires the Subjects it speaks of shou'd be born of the SPIRIT, cannot speak of Infants.

To evade this, Mr. *Wall* insinuates, that because it is and must be allow'd, that the HOLY SPIRIT, *besides his Office of converting the Heart, does seal and apply pardon of Sin, and other Promises of the Covenant*; this is to be taken for all that's meant in the Text by *born of the SPIRIT.* But as this is not confirm'd by any Text of Scripture, I leave you to judg whether it answers the Force of the Phrase: and I will conclude what I have said on this Text, with Dr. *Whitby*'s judicious Observations upon it.

1. *Infants must be excepted from this Necessity, as being incapable of knowing, and therefore of transgressing this Command.*

2. *They also are to be excepted who want that Baptism they desire, not out of Contempt, but of Necessity, as dying before they can procure it: thus tho the Infant who died before the eighth Day, died without the Sign of the Covenant, the* Jews *never thought fit to circumcise 'em before that Day; and since it is not the washing of the Body, but the* Stipulation of a good Conscience *that renders* Baptism *saving,* 1 Pet. iii. 21. *it cannot be purely the Want, but the Contempt of that which must condemn us. And,*

3. *Whatever Ignorance of the Precept, or Mistake about the Nature of it, renders not Men incapable of the Baptism of the HOLY GHOST, can never render them incapable of the Salvation promis'd the baptiz'd.*

The next Observation our Author makes from St. *Hermas*'s Words, is grounded particularly on this, that St. *Hermas* represents the Patriarchs and holy Men before CHRIST as having need to be baptiz'd, and actually being so in the Life they are now in; for his Words are these: *It was*

neceſſary for them to come up by Water, that they might be at Reſt; for they cou'd not otherwiſe enter into the Kingdom of GOD, than by putting off the Mortality of their former Life: they therefore, after they were dead, were ſeal'd with the Seal of the SON of GOD, &c. From whence Mr. *Wall* infers, that if Baptiſm was in St. *Hermas*'s Opinion ſo neceſſary to the Salvation of theſe juſt Men, as that they cou'd not be ſav'd without it, and therefore were baptiz'd after their Death in that ſeparate State; then he muſt needs have thought it as neceſſary for all other Perſons, and Infants among the reſt: and therefore the Church of that time practis'd the Baptiſm of Infants.

But, what wild ſort of Logick is this? for there's no manner of Connection between the Propoſitions. Suppoſe St. *Hermas* did think thoſe Perſons were baptiz'd in their ſeparate State; it does not therefore follow, that he thought Infants muſt be baptiz'd in this: nor, if he did think ſo, that the Church of that Time practis'd Pædobaptiſm; for St. *Hermas* gives not the leaſt Hint of that: and yet Mr. *Wall* pretends only to cite the Fathers in this Diſpute, as they relate, not to their own private Opinions, but to the Practice of the whole Church. So that his way of arguing here has no Tendency to the Propoſition he ought to prove, which, to ſay the beſt of it, is grounded on obſcure uncertain Parables, and very diſtant licentious Inferences from 'em.

But to anſwer more diſtinctly.

1. St. *Hermas* is only deſcribing a Viſion, to repreſent the building up of the Church; and therefore every Particular cannot be fairly underſtood in the Letter; according to the known Rule, *Similitudes don't run on all Four.* Thus our SAVIOUR's Parable of the ten Virgins with their Lamps,

Lamps, is not to be underſtood, that ten Virgins, five wiſe and five fooliſh, ſhall go forth to meet Him at his ſecond Coming; the firſt five being well provided with Oil, and having their Lamps trim'd at the Alarm: and the others being ſurpriz'd, with their Lamps unlighted and having no Oil, and that they ſhall attempt to buy ſome, or the like. And tho our LORD is pleas'd to repreſent his Care and Patience towards us, under the Notion of the Dreſſer of a Vineyard, *Luke* xiii. 6, *&c.* no Man can imagine he will literally dreſs and prune us, but only that he does in us what is equivalent to dreſſing and pruning to a Vine.

Now theſe not being true Hiſtorys, but only figurative Repreſentations of ſomething, I wonder Mr. *Wall* ſhou'd uſe 'em otherwiſe. He knows the Books he argues from, are nothing but Viſions; and therefore, tho it be ever ſo expreſs that the Patriarchs were baptiz'd, 'tis no more to be underſtood in the Letter, than the other things I have mention'd: they were baptiz'd, that is, in Viſion only, not in Deed. Or, if our Author's way of arguing be juſt, it equally follows, that in the other World we muſt all be transform'd into Stones, and compoſe a lofty Pile of Building. But as this Inference will not be allow'd, ſo neither ought the other.

2. Beſides, St. *Hermas* cannot be thought to mean thoſe juſt Perſons were really baptiz'd with material Water, becauſe, in the ſeparate State they are in, their Bodys being conſum'd, and that of 'em which remains alive being only Spirit, they are utterly incapable of real Baptiſm: for 'tis altogether inconceivable that Spirits can be immers'd in Water. And as Stones were not the Perſons, but only repreſented 'em; ſo their Baptiſm was only a Repreſentation of ſomething elſe.

elſe. The Paſſage therefore can do our Author no manner of Service; for 'tis only of material Baptiſm we are diſputing, not a viſionary, nor a myſtical one.

3. Tho St. *Hermas* ſhou'd be allow'd to plead for the Neceſſity of Baptiſm to thoſe juſt Men, yet this has no relation to Infant-Baptiſm; nor does St. *Hermas* give any ground to imagine he had Infants in his Thoughts: He ſpeaks only of Adult Perſons, who had committed actual Sins, from which, he might ſuppoſe, they needed to be waſh'd. But it is no Conſequence, that it muſt be as neceſſary to others that are not Adult; no more than becauſe 'tis uſeful to Men, it muſt therefore be ſo to Angels. Nay, on the contrary, he ſeems very plainly to exclude Infants from being capable of receiving any Benefit by Baptiſm: for in this very Paſſage he intimates, they were to be baptiz'd for ſomething done in their former Life, which he calls *the Mortality of their former Life*; and he can't be underſtood to mean any thing but the Offences they had committed in that Life. Infants therefore having no ſuch Mortality of a former Life to account for, were not repreſented by St. *Hermas* to have been baptiz'd: and ſince he makes Baptiſm neceſſary to the Patriarchs, *&c.* only on that account, it cannot poſſibly be apply'd to the Caſe of Infants.

It may be added alſo, that St. *Hermas* here makes it equally neceſſary to * *take up the Name of the SON of GOD.* And he likewiſe aſſerts, that † *it will avail nothing to take up the Name of the SON of GOD, unleſs thou ſhalt alſo receive*

* Lib. 3. Simil. 9. cap. 12.
† Ibid. cap. 13.

their

their (viz. the Virgins) *Garments from them.* Now the Names of these Virgins, he says, are ‖ *Faith, Abstinence, Power, Patience,* &c. *whoever bears these Names, and the Name of the* SON *of* GOD, *shall enter into the Kingdom.* I suppose the least Mr. *Wall* understands by *taking the Name of the* SON *of* GOD, is, to be baptiz'd; and then it's plain, St. *Hermas* declares Baptism without *Faith, Abstinence,* &c. will avail nothing, or is of no use at all: from whence it's manifest, not only that this Passage can't be improv'd for Infant-Baptism; but also, that it yields a good Argument against it: for if Baptism signify nothing without those Virtues, then to be sure St. *Hermas* did not think it of any use to Infants, who have 'em not.

4. But in the last place, if St. *Hermas* shou'd be thought to make Baptism necessary to the Salvation of Infants; yet since he finds an Expedient for the Patriarchs, *&c.* who liv'd before Christ, to be baptiz'd in their separate State, why mayn't we suppose he thought Infants ought not to be baptiz'd till they come into that separate State too? The Patriarchs were suppos'd to receive Baptism there, because they cou'd not know and believe in Jesus here; and the same Reason holds exactly as to Infants. So that, after all, if our Author's Citation proves any thing in favour of Infant-Baptism, 'tis only, that they shall be baptiz'd in the other World: But be this as it will, 'tis suf-

‖ Ibid. cap. 15. Quicunque itaque portant hæc Nomina, & Nomen FILII DEI, in Regnum DEI poterunt intrare.

ficient

ficient that they are not to be baptiz'd here, which is all we inſiſt on.

Mr. *Wall* cites ‖ another Paſſage from St. *Hermas*, which I had ſome time ſince noted as an Inſtance againſt Pædobaptiſm. 'Tis ſtrange that the ſame Words ſhou'd be cited to ſuch contrary Purpoſes. They are thus tranſlated: *All Infants are valu'd by the* LORD, *and eſteem'd the firſt of all.* It is very dubious, what Infants are here meant, whether Infants in Age, or Infants in Chriſtianity: and what renders it ſo doubtful, is a Sentence at the beginning of this Chapter: *Such as have believ'd like ſincere Children* ('tis *Infantes* in the *Latin*). And ſince he here ſpeaks of ſuch Infants as believ'd, he may perhaps afterwards too mean only ſuch. Dr. *Wake* ſeems to have underſtood the Paſſage ſo, by his ſupplying the Word *Such*; and the Words our Author cites refer to *ſuch* Infants as were ſpoken of before.

But if they ſhou'd refer to Infants in Age, as perhaps they may; yet even then I don't ſee how they can be ſtrain'd to ſignify that Infants ought to be baptiz'd. For here is no mention of Baptiſm at all: and therefore unleſs our Author can demonſtrate for a general Principle, that all Perſons whom GOD eſteems ought to be baptiz'd, it will be very difficult for any one to imagine how Baptiſm can be deduc'd from hence. No Man can ſee any neceſſary Connection between GOD's Love and Baptiſm; and the Scriptures no where furniſh Mr. *Wall* with this Piece of Divinity. The holy Angels are certainly highly eſteem'd and favour'd by Him; but no body pretends they ought therefore to be baptiz'd. In

‖ Part I. pag. 6.

like

like manner, Almighty GOD may have a great Esteem for Infants, and love 'em according to His infinite Mercy and Compassion, without requiring of them the Ceremony of being baptiz'd. At least, since St. *Hermas* no where confirms this Supposition, that all whom GOD esteems ought to be baptiz'd; it must pass only for our Author's own Conjecture, which renders the Argument from this Place invalid: for since both the Premises are not St. *Hermas*'s, 'tis plain, the Conclusion is not his.

On the contrary, it's very natural to conclude from the Words, that this Father neither held the Necessity of Infant-Baptism, nor practis'd it; for he says *All Infants*, without exception, as if they were all upon the same Level, and therefore baptiz'd or unbaptiz'd, it matters not: *All are valu'd by the* LORD, *and esteem'd the first of all*, merely as they are Infants, and therefore † *Innocent*. And no where throughout his Writings has he left the least Intimation, that he ever once thought of the baptizing 'em. If he had known any thing of incorporating Children into the Church, 'tis strange in his Representations of the several Materials of which the Church was built, that he shou'd never give Infants one Place, but constantly neglect them; especially considering how exceeding nice and particular he is, and that he frequently had the fittest Occasions in the World to introduce 'em. But besides this total Silence in such Cases, which is very considerable, this Father has several Expressions which are as inconsistent with the Notion of Infant-Baptism, as any thing can be. For instance, to mention

† Lib. 3. cap. 31.

but

but one, *Chap.* xxxi. he ſays, ‖ *And I ſay unto you all, whoever have receiv'd this Seal, keep Simplicity, and remember not Affronts*, &c. Now this Inſtruction is given with the utmoſt Latitude, doubly enforc'd both by an univerſal Collective *All*, and then an univerſal Diſtributive *Whoever*; than which nothing can be more extenſive. But the things mention'd there not falling within the Power and Cognizance of Infants, it follows, they cannot be intended, and that St. *Hermas* did not think them to be of their Number who had, or ought to have, receiv'd the Seal. It is not poſſible any Inference ſhou'd be more direct and neceſſary.

But to return back to Mr. *Wall*'s Management of the other Citation. He ſuppoſes, 1. Christ's Words, *Matth.* xix. 14. *Suffer little Children, and forbid them not to come unto Me, for of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven*, are a plain Argument for Infant-Baptiſm. And, 2. That the Words of St. *Hermas* are of the ſame Import.

As to the Words of our LORD, which Mr. *Wall* (with many other Pædobaptiſts) ſo much perverts, if any thing is plain concerning 'em, it is, that they have no relation to Baptiſm at all, nor to any thing neceſſarily connected with it. You know the Story in the Goſpel, and the Circumſtances of it; but what is there, I beſeech you, in the whole matter, which can make our Adverſarys faſten on this Place? It can only be the mention of Children: and they might as well have cited all the Paſſages in Scripture where Children are nam'd.

But Mr. *Wall* does not reaſon from the Words in *Matth.* xix. 14. but only cites 'em, as if they

‖ Dico autem vobis omnibus, quicunque Sigillum hoc accepiſtis, Simplicitatem habete, neque Offenſorum memores eſtote, *&c.*

were

were very plain to his Purpose; and therefore we are to seek in other Authors for the Argument. † Dr. *Hammond* himself reckons this among the more imperfect ways of proving the Point, and therefore our Author shou'd not so easily have taken it for granted. But Dr. *Whitby* is pleas'd to improve the Passage to the utmost Advantage; and he being in general so very fair and sincere a Writer, and comprehending the whole Substance of what can be urg'd from the Place, I will examine what he has said.

His first and second Observations, namely, That they were Infants in Age who were brought to CHRIST; and that they were brought by such as believ'd CHRIST to be a Prophet sent from GOD, may be allow'd: but the third thing, *viz.* That they were not brought to be heal'd of any Diseases, cannot be easily granted: for tho it is not expressly said, they were; yet since it was the LORD's Custom frequently to heal by laying on His Hands, it is probable enough this was the Design of those who brought 'em to Him, tho 'tis only said, they brought 'em to have His Hands laid on 'em. The Imposition of His Hands cou'd not well be the ultimate End, but only the intermediate, in order to something else, which might be *healing*, for what appears, but can't be suppos'd to be their being baptiz'd. Or if CHRIST did not lay His Hands on 'em to heal 'em, it was perhaps, as ‖ *Origen* puts it: *They believ'd that no evil Spirit cou'd enter, nor any other Misfortune befal those Infants or Children whom CHRIST had once touch'd, by reason of some Virtue that was thereby communicated to 'em. And since*

† *Six Queries*, pag. 195.
‖ *In* Matth. *pag.* 373. B.

the

the evil Powers are continually lying in wait to corrupt Mens Minds from the beginning, I am of Opinion, that they who brought the Children to CHRIST, *seeing His mighty Power, brought them to Him, that by laying His Hands on 'em,* &c. *by means of the Touch* (διὰ τῆς Ἁφῆς) *every Evil might be expell'd,* &c.

There is therefore no Neceſſity to ſuppoſe ſo readily, that they were brought to receive ſpiritual Bleſſings: For, what ſpiritual Bleſſings cou'd they receive? Not Remiſſion of Sins, ſays the Doctor; for the *Jews* did not think 'em guilty of any; and we never find Hands were laid on any for that purpoſe. But it was, ſays he, *to obtain for them ſome ſpiritual Bleſſing appertaining to the Kingdom of* GOD. What ſpiritual Bleſſing this cou'd be, or on what Grounds 'tis aſſerted, I ſee not; and the Doctor gives no reaſon for it. But he puts another Suppoſition borrow'd from Dr. *Lightfoot*, that CHRIST laid His Hands on 'em, *to own them as belonging to His Kingdom.* But this cou'd not be the Meaning of it, both becauſe we no where find this Ceremony us'd for this purpoſe; and He had juſt before declar'd, *of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven*, before *He took 'em in His Arms, and laid His Hands on 'em.* The laying on of His Hands therefore muſt be for ſome other End.

Beſides, if they were capable of ſpiritual Bleſſings, as undoubtedly they are of being ſav'd by CHRIST, what's all this to Infant-Baptiſm? Will it follow, that becauſe they may be happy hereafter, they muſt be baptiz'd here? Many Infants ſhall, and all may be ſav'd without being baptiz'd. And there's a great deal to this purpoſe comprehended in our SAVIOUR's ſaying, *of ſuch*, ſpeaking even of unbaptiz'd Infants, *is the Kingdom of Heaven.*

The

The fourth Observation the Doctor is pleas'd to make, is particularly on these Words, *for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven:* from whence he thinks it may reasonably be collected, *that there is something in little Children, why they shou'd not be hinder'd from coming to him, besides their being Emblems of Humility*; and this he supposes can be nothing but *the Fitness of them to be early dedicated to the Service of* GOD, *and to enter into Covenant with him by the Rites appointed by him for that End.* But tho it will be readily allow'd, that Infants are capable of receiving the Kingdom, it can in no wise follow, that this means nothing else but their Fitness to enter into Covenant. This is directly begging the Question. If by Kingdom of Heaven were meant the Church of CHRIST, there might indeed be some greater colour for the Doctor's way of arguing: but if it means only the Kingdom of Glory, as it plainly does, then the Doctor's Argument is grounded on a Mistake; for tho Infants are Subjects of the Kingdom of Glory, it will not on that account appear necessary for 'em to be baptiz'd, in order to qualify 'em for that Glory: on the contrary, it rather follows, since as Infants they are Subjects of that Kingdom, they have no need of this Ceremony to give 'em a Right which they have already.

The Right Reverend Bishop of *Salisbury* says, that || *whatever these Words may signify mystically, the literal Meaning of them is, that little Children may be admitted into the Dispensation of the* MESSIAS; *and by consequence, that they may be baptiz'd.* Thus his Lordship seems to make it a plain Case; but I can't perceive how the Words have any re-

|| *Articles*, p. 307.

lation to Childrens being receiv'd into that Diſpenſation at all. *The Kingdom of Heaven* can in no wiſe mean ſo here, tho it be true, as his Lordſhip ſays, this is the Senſe of the Words almoſt univerſally thro the whole Goſpel: for St. *Mark* has preſerv'd ſome of our LORD's Words on that occaſion, which make it neceſſary to underſtand thereby the Kingdom of Glory: thus *Ch.* X. *Ver.* 15. our LORD ſays, *Whoſoever ſhall not receive the Kingdom of* GOD *as a little Child, he ſhall not enter therein*; that is, into Glory; for into the Church the greateſt Villains may be admitted, if they conceal their Wickedneſs; ſo that he muſt mean they ſhall not enter into his glorious Kingdom. Beſides, if the Kingdom did mean the Church, how does it appear Infants were to be admitted into it by Baptiſm? Baptiſm is the only way of admitting Adult Perſons, but is no where preſcrib'd to Infants. I ſhou'd rather imagine from the Words, that if Infants are to be admitted at all, by any Ceremony, it muſt be only by laying on of Hands, and by Prayer; for neither our LORD's Words, nor his Actions give us room to think of any other.

And if this way of arguing be good, it may equally be urg'd, that Infants ought to be communicated too; for if becauſe *of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven*, they may therefore be admitted into the Diſpenſation of the MESSIAS, and conſequently have a Right to the Privileges and Sacraments of it, they muſt have a Right to the Supper as well as to Baptiſm. But his Lordſhip, and our Adverſarys, do refuſe 'em one; and we beg leave to refuſe 'em the other for the very ſame Reaſons, *viz.* becauſe they are not capable of it, nor of the Conditions which the Church of *England* it ſelf confeſſes are requir'd of Perſons to be baptiz'd, *viz. Faith and Repentance.*

Since

Since then there is nothing in CHRIST's Words for the Practice of the Pædobaptists, the Passage of St. *Hermas*, which our Author compares with these Words of CHRIST, cannot be thought to prove by any suppos'd Affinity between 'em, that St. *Hermas*, or the Church of that Time, knew any thing of Infant-Baptism. Besides, I have not only shewn the Arguments from the Writings of the Fathers hitherto, have no reference to it; but also, as far as things of this nature can be shewn, that all of 'em to this Time, namely, for about a hundred Years after CHRIST's Birth, believ'd nothing at all of it, for what they say is very inconsistent with that Practice. In my next, I will also examine what is said from St. *Justin* and others, in the order in which Mr. *Wall* has plac'd 'em. I am,

SIR,

Yours, *&c.*

LETTER XII.

What Mr. Wall *produces from the Writings of the se*
cond Century examin'd. A Paſſage in St. Juſti
conſider'd. It makes nothing for Infant-Baptiſm
Neither does it ſpeak of Original Sin, as our Autho
pretends. Mr. Wall *has perverted the Words. H*
Tranſlation of 'em unintelligible. Ἀπὸ τῦ Ἀδὰ
means from Adam. *Another Miſconſtruction note*
The Phraſe explain'd by a Paſſage in Dionyſi
Halicarnaſſeus; *and another in* Thucydides. *A*
other Paſſage from St. Juſtin *conſider'd. He do*
not call Baptiſm Circumciſion. He cou'd not mea
Baptiſm by the ſpiritual Circumciſion he ſpeaks o
What he underſtands by ſpiritual Circumciſion.
ther Writers of the primitive Church talk in t
ſame manner. Coloſſ. ii. 11, 12. *conſider'd. T*
Scripture no where calls Baptiſm Circumciſion. T
Words in themſelves are not capable of the Senſe o
Adverſarys give 'em. The Antients did not c
Baptiſm the Circumciſion without Hands, as M
Wall *pretends. Mr.* Wall's *Argument from t*
Parallel between Circumciſion and Baptiſm, ſhewn
be groundleſs. The Principle on which 'tis founde
evidently falſe. Some of the Conſequences of
as that Baptiſm muſt be adminiſter'd only on
eighth Day: that Females muſt not be baptiz
As the Apoſtles did not make Circumciſion th
Rule in relation to Baptiſm; ſo neither ſhou'd
Another Paſſage from St. Juſtin. *'Tis not*
be imagin'd he ſhou'd forbear to mention Infa
Baptiſm, if it had been then practis'd. Or howe
he ought not to have ſpoken ſo as is inconſiſtent w

that Practice. The Passage is directly against Infant-Baptism. The Reasons why Mr. Wall *cites this Passage, tho' he confesses it makes nothing for Infant-Baptism. The first Reason makes against him. His next Reason, that Regeneration is put for Baptism, groundless. St.* Justin *never understands Regeneration so. Baptism not Regeneration, but the Symbol of it. The third Reason contradicts his former Assertion. Another Passage from St.* Justin. *Which Mr.* Wall *draws to his side by a very unfair Translation.* Ἐκ παιδων *signifys* from their Childhood. *Illustrated by Instances from* Cicero: *From* Laertius: *From* Plato: *From* Plutarch: *From* Origen: *From* Theophilus Antiochenus: *From the Scriptures. Mr.* Wall *himself translates a Passage of St.* Basil *thus on another Occasion. The famous Passage from St.* Irenæus *consider'd. 'Tis not genuine. Cardinal* Baronius *observes, the latter part of the Chapter contradicts the beginning.* Petavius's *Answer to this proves nothing. The Author of the last part of the Chapter attempts to confirm a manifest Falshood, by the Authority of the Antients from St.* John, *which St.* Irenæus *cou'd never have done. Mr.* Dodwell's *Pretence, that St.* John, *&c. judg'd of our* LORD's *Age by his Countenance, too weak, and groundless. They cou'd not but know the Time of our* LORD's *Birth more exactly. St.* Irenæus *cou'd not think* CHRIST *arriv'd to near so much as his* 40*th Year: the contrary being so evident from the Censual Rolls then in being, and from the Disputes with the Adversarys of the Christian Religion. Nay, it appears from St.* Irenæus's *own Words, that he was not in so gross an Error. He fixes the Time of the* LORD's *Birth. The Time of his Passion computed: From the Destruction of* Jerusalem: *From the Time of* Pontius Pilate's *Government, and* Tiberius's *Reign. Mr.* Dodwell's *At-*

tempt to excuſe the Extravagance of this ſpurious Paſſage, wholly uſeleſs. Beſides, the Paſſage is taken only from a very bad Tranſlation; as learned Men confeſs; viz. Scaliger: Du Pin: *Mr.* Dodwell: *Dr.* Grabe. *This may alſo appear, by comparing it with the remaining Fragments of the Original. Again, the Word* Regenerated *in this Paſſage, does not mean, Baptiz'd. The* Jews *did not give riſe to this way of ſpeaking. The Scripture-Notion of Regeneration.* John iii. 5. *conſider'd. The Regeneration there mention'd conſiſts in the Operations of the Spirit; of which Baptiſm is the Sign and Seal. And this appears from our* LORD's *own Words following.* Titus iii. 5. *conſider'd. That the Antients never mean Baptiſm, but an internal Change by Regeneration, ſhewn from* Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Origen, Clemens Romanus, *St.* Barnabas: *And St.* Irenæus *no where uſes the Word, as our Author pretends he always does. The Inference from theſe Obſervations. A Contradiction of Mr.* Wall's. *Another Exception to the Paſſage cited from St.* Irenæus, *is, that* Infantes *does not neceſſarily mean ſuch young Children as the Pædobaptiſts admit to Baptiſm.* Omnis Ætas *does not always include Infants. As appears by an Inſtance from St.* Cyprian; *The* Recognitions; Dionyſius *of* Alexandria. *Nor does the Enumeration of the ſeveral Ages make it neceſſary to underſtand ſuch Infants as are not capable of Reaſon. Infancy, according to St.* Irenæus *himſelf, reaches to ten Years of Age: As Mr.* Dodwell *alſo thinks. The Inference. Perſons under Ten capable of Inſtruction and Baptiſm. Recapitulation and Concluſion.*

SIR,

THE firſt Century of Chriſtianity I have already diſpatch'd, and am now to examine the ſecond.

Mr.

Mr. *Wall* begins with St. *Justin* the Martyr, who liv'd about *Anno CHRISTI* 140. but the Pieces he cites of this Father were all writ after 150. so that he passes over half the second Century without any Attempt upon it; and therefore I conclude that at least for 150 Years after CHRIST Infant-Baptism was not known in the World, or however, that our Adversarys are not able to prove it was.

The first Passage our Author cites, is out of the Dialogue with *Trypho* the *Jew*, which he says is † *only to shew, that in these Times so very near the Apostles, they spake of Original Sin affecting all Mankind descended of* Adam: *and understood that besides the actual Sins of each particular Person, there is in our Nature it self, since the Fall, something that needs Redemption and Forgiveness by the Merits of CHRIST.* But this does not concern the baptizing of Infants; and therefore Mr. *Wall* adds of his own, *And that is ordinarily to be apply'd to every particular Person by Baptism:* which signifys nothing, unless he can shew it is St. *Justin*'s Assertion. He is to prove, that St. *Justin* and the Church in his Time thought so, and not to suppose they did: nor is it sufficient to say the Scripture teaches it; for the Question here immediately is not what the Scriptures teach, but what St. *Justin* teaches; tho by the way the Scripture no more teaches that our SAVIOUR's Merits are to be apply'd to any Persons by Baptism, than it does that his Merits must be apply'd by *Faith* or by the *Supper*, in which the Cup is the *New Covenant in his Blood.* St. *Justin*'s Expressions therefore are of no force, unless he had gone upon our Author's Principle, which he does not appear to have done.

† Part I. pag. 13.

All that can be urg'd from his mentioning Original Sin, I have fully anſwer'd † before. Beſides, it is much to be queſtion'd, whether St. *Juſtin*, and moſt of the Antients of the firſt Centurys, believ'd the Notion. Mr. *Wall* has very much perverted the Words of this Paſſage, to make 'em ſpeak to his purpoſe; and given ſuch a Tranſlation of 'em as no School-boy wou'd have made. Whether he did it out of Ignorance or Inadvertency, I ſhall not determine.

The Place, I think, ſhou'd be render'd thus: ‖ *As alſo, neither did he ſubmit to be born and crucify'd, as being under any neceſſity to do it; but he did this for Mankind, which from* (not *by*) Adam *was fallen under Death and the Guile of the Serpent, by their own Act and Deed, every one having done wickedly.* This makes the Paſſage rather oppoſite to the Doctrine of Original Sin, than in favour of it. Mr. *Wall*'s Tranſlation is hardly intelligible: *But he did this for Mankind, which by* Adam *was fallen under Death, and the Guile of the Serpent, beſide the particular Cauſe which each Man had of ſinning.*

But you ſee, as I have render'd it, the Senſe is very natural and eaſy. And that St. *Juſtin* meant as I underſtand him, appears from the Words immediately following thoſe already tranſcrib'd: * *For GOD willing that all Angels and Men ſhou'd be free Agents, and that their Actions ſhou'd*

† Pag. 403, &c.

‖ Dialog. cum Tryph. pag. 315, 316. Ὥσπερ δὲ οὐδὲ τὸ γενηθῆναι Αὐτὸν καὶ σταυρωθῆναι, ὡς ἐνδεὴς τούτων, ὑπέμεινεν, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ Γένους τοῦ τῶν Ἀνθρώπων, ὃ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ ὑπὸ Θανάτου καὶ Πλάνης τὴν τοῦ Ὄφεως ἐπιπλοκὴν, παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν Αἰτίαν ἕκαστος αὐτῶν πεποιήκεν.

* Ibid. pag. 316. A. Βεβούλητο δὲ τούτους ἐν ἐλευθέρᾳ Προαιρέσει, καὶ αὐτεξουσίους γενομένους, τούς τε Ἀγγέλους καὶ τοὺς Ἀνθρώπους,

should be determin'd by their own free Choice——*that if they did what was pleasing to him, they might be kept incorruptible and free from Punishment; but if they did wickedly, he might punish every one according to his Pleasure.* Now to say here, that every Man was design'd by GOD to stand upon his own Bottom, and to connect this by the illative Particle *for*, to another Sentence wherein he says all fell in *Adam*, is so great an Absurdity, that we cannot with any good Manners suppose St. *Justin* to be guilty of it; for nothing can be more contradictory, than to say all are Sinners in or by *Adam*, and yet that none are Sinners but by their own free Choice and Action.

Besides, it is necessary to understand St. *Justin* as I have done, even from the Propriety of the Phrase he makes use of. That ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ means *from Adam*, and not as our Author renders it *by Adam*, might be prov'd from an infinite number of Instances: but I need only mention *Rom.* v. 14. where we find exactly the same Phrase, in the very same Sense too; which makes it not improbable that St. *Justin* had his Eye upon this very Place, and alludes to it: *Death reign'd from* Adam; that is, in St. *Justin*'s Words, *Mankind from* Adam *was fallen under Death*, &c. But the Sense Mr. *Wall* wou'd put upon ἀπὸ is several times in this Chapter express'd by διὰ: thus, Ver. 9. *We shall be sav'd from Wrath thro him* (δι' αὐτοῦ) and Ver. 10. *We were reconciled to GOD by* (διὰ) *the Death of his SON:* and Ver. 11. (δι' ὃν) *By whom we have now receiv'd the Atonement:* and in

---

Ἀνθρώπους, ὁ ΘΕΟΣ πρᾶξαι ὅσα ἔκρινεν ἐνεδυνάμωσε δύνασθαι ποιεῖν, ἐποίησεν· εἰ μὲν τὰ εὐάρεστα Αὐτῷ αἱρεῖντο, καὶ ἄφθαρτους καὶ ἀπαθεῖς αὐτοὺς τηρῆσαι· ἐὰν δὲ πονηρεύσωνται, ὡς Αὐτῷ δοκεῖ ἔκρινον κολάζειν.

the

the next Verſe it's ſaid not ἀπὸ, but δι' ἑνὸς Ἀνθρώπου, *by one Man Sin enter'd into the World*, &c. by which 'tis evident, that ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ and διὰ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ mean different things.

As to the other Miſconſtruction of St. *Juſtin's* Words, which I think Mr. *Wall* has made, 'tis not only very conſiderable, in that it makes St. *Juſtin* ſpeak inconſiſtently, and ſo as not to be underſtood; but 'tis plain alſo to all who have any tolerable Skill in the *Greek*, that παρὰ, which Mr. *Wall* here renders *beſide*, ought to be render'd *for*, *by*, *becauſe of*, &c. Thus that common Phraſe παρ' ὃ ſignifys *for which Reaſon*, or the like; ſo *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus* ſays, * παρ' ὅ, *for which Reaſon alſo the things mention'd in the Epilogue are call'd Exclamations.* In his *Roman Antiquitys*, he has the very Phraſe of St. *Juſtin*; and the Occaſion will convince you, that it muſt be underſtood as I have tranſlated it. *Siccius Dentatus*, an experienc'd Commander, accompany'd *Romilius* the *Conſul*, with a Band of 800 Veterans, againſt the *Æqui*. In this Expedition *Romilius*, in order to ſacrifice this great Man to his Ambition and Envy, ſends him with his Veterans to attack the Enemy, under ſuch Diſadvantages as they muſt neceſſarily have been all cut to pieces. *Siccius* undertakes the Attempt, but leads his Men unknown to the General another way, and ſo falling upon the Enemy unexpectedly while the two Armys were engag'd, gave 'em a total Overthrow. *Siccius* at his Return to *Rome*, relates the whole Story to the Tribune and People, with the Conſul's Deſign upon 'em, † *and that it was by his own Valour*

* Ars Rhetoric. cap. 10. §. 18. Παρ' ὃ καὶ Ἐπιφωνήματα καλεῖσι τὰ ἐν Ἐπιλόγοις λεγόμενα.

† Dionyſ. Halicarnaſſ. Antiq. Rom. lib. 10. p. 641. Καὶ ὅτι παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν Ἀρετὴν καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ πεπολεμηκότων ἐπικρατοῦντ

Valour and Conduct (παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν Ἀρετὴν, ſays *Dionyſius*) *and of thoſe who were with him, whom the Conſul had deſign'd for Deſtruction, that the Enemy's Camp was taken*, &c. 'Tis plain here, from the Circumſtances of the Story, that (παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν) means *by their own*, in oppoſition to another's: and ſo too it ſhou'd in St. *Juſtin* ſignify *by their own Fault*, in oppoſition to another's. There is another Inſtance to the ſame purpoſe in *Thucydides*, where the Senſe is much the ſame as in St. *Juſtin*, tho the Expreſſion is ſomething vary'd. *Pericles* is ſetting forth the Inconveniences of the divided State, and conſequently the Weakneſs of the *Peloponneſians*: * *Some indeed, ſays he, are for proſecuting their Revenge with the utmoſt Application; but others are fearful, leſt they prejudice their own particular Affairs: and when after a thouſand Delays, they are at laſt got together, they can beſtow but a very little Time on the common Good; for they have none to ſpare from their own particular Concerns. And every one fancys the Publick will ſuffer nothing by his Neglect* (παρὰ τὴν ἑαυτῶ Ἀμέλειαν). This is exactly as St. *Juſtin* ſays, all Men are fallen under Death, παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν Αἰτίαν, *by their own particular Fault.*

The next Paſſage of St. *Juſtin*, which our Author uſes, is in the ſame Dialogue, where he meets with ſome Expreſſions, from whence he ventures to infer, tho very unfairly, that St. *Juſtin* thought Baptiſm was to Chriſtians

---

κείων Ἀνδρῶν, ὃς ἀποθανεμένης ἀπέσειλαν οἱ Ἕλληνες, ὅ, τε χάραξ ὁ τῶν Αἰχμανῶν ἑλήφθη, &c.

* De Bell. Peloponneſiac. lib. 1. cap. 141. Καὶ γὰρ οἱ μὲν ὡς μάλιστα τιμωρήσασθαί τινα βέλονται, οἱ δὲ, ὡς ἧκιστα τὰ οἰκεῖα φθεῖραι. Χρόνιοί τε ξυνιόντες, ἐν βραχεῖ μὲν Μοίρῳ Σκοπεῖσι τι τῶν κοινῶν, πολὺ δὲ πλείονι τὰ οἰκεῖα προΐενται. Καὶ ἕκαστος ὁ παρὰ τὴν ἑαυτῶ Ἀμέλειαν οἴεται βλάπτειν, &c.

instead

inſtead of Circumciſion, and therefore, like that, ought to be adminiſter'd to Infants. The holy Martyr, arguing againſt the Ceremonys of the Law, takes occaſion to oppoſe to the *carnal Circumciſion* that which is *ſpiritual: And this, we being Sinners, thro GOD's Mercy have receiv'd*, ſays he, *by Baptiſm; and every one is permitted to receive it in the ſame way.* But if Mr. *Wall*'s Concluſion from hence is fair, I don't know what is otherwiſe. For,

1. What can be more evident than that he does not ſay Baptiſm is the Chriſtian Circumciſion, but only, that Chriſtians receive the ſpiritual Circumciſion, whatever it is, by Baptiſm? which is far from ſaying, Baptiſm it ſelf is it. By Baptiſm we receive the Remiſſion of our Sins; but how abſurd wou'd it be therefore to ſay, Remiſſion of Sins is nothing elſe but Baptiſm? What we receive, is not the inſtrument or Medium by which we receive it. We receive all things by the Mercy of GOD in CHRIST; and yet thoſe things are not that Divine Perfection we call the *Mercy of GOD*, but only the Effects and Conſequences of it. In like manner, we are not to abuſe St. *Juſtin* and his Words ſo much as to fancy he meant, that the ſpiritual Circumciſion he ſays we receive by Baptiſm, is Baptiſm it ſelf. Nay,

2. He plainly ſhews he meant no ſuch thing: for the Circumciſion which he oppoſes to the *Jewiſh* in the Fleſh, he expreſly ſays is that *which* Enoch, *and thoſe like him obſerv'd*; and yet he ſays, *We* have receiv'd the ſame by Baptiſm. No Man ſure can really think he means only Baptiſm by all this; for when, where, and by whom was *Enoch* baptiz'd?

And the Martyr often talks directly contrary to our Author's Gloſs; of which I will produce ſome

some Instances, to let you see how much Mr. *Wall* misrepresents him. Thus he distinguishes between Baptism and the Christian Circumcision, when he explains, ‖ *Wash ye and make ye clean, and put away the evil of your doings*, Isaiah i. 16. and says, GOD *commands you to wash with this Laver, and to be circumcis'd with the true Circumcision.* The true Circumcision answers here directly to the putting *away the evil of their doings*, and not to their *washing*. As washing and putting away the Evil, *&c.* are two different things; so Baptism, which according to St. *Justin*, answers to one, and Circumcision which answers to the other, must be different likewise: and what the true Circumcision consists in, the following Words of *Isaiah* teach us, *cease to do evil*, ver. 17. *learn to do well, seek Judgment, relieve the oppress'd*, &c. And if all this is included in the true Circumcision, according to St. *Justin*, how can any one say he took Baptism to be that Circumcision? and which he afterwards calls * *our Circumcision.*

In another place he says, † *Let a Man be a* Scythian *or a* Persian, *if he receive the Knowledg of* GOD, *and his* CHRIST, *and observe the eternal Rules of Justice, he is circumcis'd with an excellent and useful Circumcision*, &c. And in the very next Page before that which our Author takes his Citation from, we have this description of the true Circumcision. ‖‖ *The Precept of Circumcision,*

‖ Dialog. pag. 235. E. Λάσασθε ἕν, καὶ νῦν καθαροὶ γένεσθε, καὶ ἀφέλεσθε τὰς Πονηρίας ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν. ὡς δὲ λάσασθαι ὑμῖν τοῦτο τὸ Λουτρὸν κελεύει ὁ ΘΕΟΣ, καὶ περιτέμνεσθαι τὴν ἀληθινὴν Περιτομήν.

* Ibid. pag. 236. C.

† Ibid. pag. 246. A.

‖‖ Dialog. pag. 260. C. Ἡ δὲ Ἐντολὴ τῆς Περιτομῆς, κελεύσα τῇ ὀγδόῃ Ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ παιδὸς περιτέμνειν τὰ γεννώμενα, Τύπ-

ον

cumciſion, which commands to circumciſe Infants on the eighth Day, was but a Type of that true Circumciſion, with which we are circumcis'd from Error and Wickedneſs, by Him who roſe from the dead the firſt Day of the Week; JESUS CHRIST *our* LORD. And again, * *He* (*viz.* Joſhua) *is ſaid in the ſecond Circumciſion to circumciſe the People with Knives of Stone* (Joſh. v. 2, &c.) *which ſignifys this Circumciſion wherewith* JESUS CHRIST *has circumcis'd us, from the worſhipping of Stones and Idols.* — *We are circumcis'd from the deceitfulneſs of this World with Knives of Stone, that is, by the Word of our* LORD JESUS. — *By Knives of Stone we are to underſtand the Doctrine of* CHRIST, *by which ſo many of the uncircumcis'd, who were once deceiv'd, are now circumcis'd with the Circumciſion of the Heart,* &c. And, in the next Page: † *Happy are we who are circumcis'd with Knives of Stone in this ſecond Circumciſion:* — *But our Circumciſion, which is the ſecond, and takes place after yours, is perform'd with ſharp Stones, that is by the Doctrines of the chief Corner Stone, preach'd by the Apoſtles, who was cut out without hands, and has circumcis'd us from Idolatry and all manner of Evil. Whoſe Hearts are ſo circumcis'd from all Wickedneſs,* &c.

ἦν τ ἀληθινῆς Περιτομῆς ἣν περιετμήθημεν ἀπὸ τ Πλάνης καὶ Πονηρίας διὰ τ ἀπὸ Νεκρῶν Ἀναστάντ τῇ μιᾷ τ Σαββάτων Ἡμέρᾳ ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ τ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ἡμῶν.

* Ibid. pag. 341. A.

† Dialog. pag. 342. A. Μακάριοι ἓν ἡμεῖς οἱ περιτμηθέντες πετρίναις Μαχαίραις τὴν δευτέραν Περιτομήν. —— ἡμῶν δὲ ἡ Περιτομὴ, ἥτις δευτέρα Ἀριθμῶ, μετὰ τὴν ὑμετέραν φανερωθῆσα, διὰ Λίθων ἀκροτόμων, τυτέστι, διὰ τ Λόγων τ διὰ Ἀποστόλων τ ἀκρογωνιαίου Λίθου, καὶ τ ἀνὰ χειρῶν τμηθέντ, περιέτμνει ἡμᾶς ἀπό τε Εἰδωλολατρείας καὶ πάσης ἁπλῶς Κακίας. Ὧν αἱ Καρδίαι ἔτως, &c.

And

And whatever may be pretended, the Primitive Church generally talk after the same manner: *Irenæus* uses almost the same Words, and tells us, ‖ *The Circumcision in the Flesh prefigur'd the Circumcision of the Heart.* And *Origen*, without any mention of Baptism, says, * *He who lays aside his false Notions and evil Imaginations, circumcises the Foreskin of his Heart.* There's a great deal more to this purpose in the same Place, which I will not transcribe. *Tertullian*, in like manner, without giving the least Intimation that Baptism is the Christian Circumcision, which succeeds in the stead of that in the Flesh, says, † *As therefore the carnal Circumcision, which was but for a time, was given for a Sign to a stubborn and rebellious People; so the Spiritual is given for the Salvation of the Obedient, as the Prophet* Jeremiah *says*, Circumcise your selves to the LORD, and take away the Foreskin of your Hearts, *chap.* iv. *ver.* 4. And so *Lactantius* says, ‖‖ *And the LORD said to* Jesus *or* Joshua, *make thee sharp Knives, and circumcise again the Children of* Israel *the second time, foreshewing there was to be another Circumcision, not of the Flesh, as was the first, which the* Jews *still practise;*

‖ Adverſ. Hæreſ. Lib. 14. cap. 3. pag. 319. a. Secundum carnem Circumciſio Circumciſionem præfigurabat ſpiritalem.

* Homil. 5. in Hierem. pag. 86. D. Ὁ ἀποθέμενος τὴν ψευδοδοξίαν, περιτέτμηται τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ, &c.

† Adverſ. Judæos, pag. 186. A. Sicut ergo Circumciſio carnalis, quæ temporalis erat, tributa in ſignum Populo contumaci, ita ſpiritalis data eſt in ſalutem Populo obaudienti, dicente Propheta Hieremia; innovate vobis Novitatem, &c.

‖‖ De vera Sapientia, Lib. 4. pag. 405. Et dixit DOMINUS ad Jeſum; fac tibi Cultellos petrinos nimis acutos, &c. ſecundam Circumciſionem futuram eſſe dixit, non carnis;

practiſe; but of the Heart and Spirit, which is given by CHRIST *the true* JESUS. You ſee, Sir, he expreſly ſays the ſecond Circumciſion *is not of the Fleſh*; but Baptiſm is plunging the Fleſh into Water, and is therefore of the Fleſh, and cannot be the ſecond Circumciſion. There is no colour of Reaſon therefore for any to pretend that the Antients, and particularly St. *Juſtin*, ever imagin'd Baptiſm ſucceeds to us inſtead of Circumciſion.

But here our Author, after his uſual method, compares St. *Juſtin*'s Words with a Place of Scripture, which is as wrongly apply'd as the reſt. * *It* (the Paſſage of St. *Juſtin*) *is to the ſame Senſe*, ſays our Author, *as is that ſaying of St.* Paul, *where he calls Baptiſm, with the putting off the Body of the Sins of the Fleſh, which attends it*, the Circumciſion of CHRIST. And here he cites *Coloſſ.* ii. 11, 12. But 'tis a great Miſtake to ſay, St. *Paul*, by Circumciſion here, means Baptiſm. For,

1. The Scriptures no where call Baptiſm Circumciſion, nor afford us any ground to imagine ſo: and to ſay that Baptiſm is intended by it here, is ſaying a thing at pleaſure, and offering as great Violence to the Words as can well be imagin'd. For ſomething very different from the Waſhing of the Body in Water, is frequently in Scripture call'd Circumciſion, and oppos'd to the Legal Circumciſion of the *Jews*; and the Scriptures ſpeak of no Circumciſion, but either that under the Law in the Fleſh, or the Spiritual in the Heart, *&c.* Even the Prophets under the *Jewiſh*

carnis; ſicut fuit prima, qua etiam nunc Judæi utuntur; ſed Cordis, ac Spiritus, quam tradidit CHRISTUS, qui verus JESUS fuit.

* Part I. pag. 13.

Oeco-

Oeconomy mention this Circumcision, as well as the Writers of the *New Testament*.

Now if Baptism is never call'd Circumcision in Scripture; but something else, *viz.* Purity of Heart, *&c.* is frequently so call'd; how natural and necessary does it appear to understand the Circumcision, *Coloss.* ii. 11. to mean, not Baptism, but Purity of Heart, *&c?* For the Analogy of Scripture has always been thought the chief Rule of Interpretation, and I think our Adversarys can fortify their Exposition by no Argument from Reason, nor so much as one single Text of Scripture. But,

2. In the next Place, the Words themselves effectually exclude that Acceptation: for they so particularlycharacterize the Circumcision there spoken of, that it can't be question'd what is meant by it; and I am amaz'd to see that Men of so much Sense and Learning as many of the Pædobaptists are, can (notwithstanding all the care St. *Paul* has taken to be understood) mistake his Meaning. The Circumcision Christians are to regard, he says, is *made without Hands*; now Baptism is not *made without Hands*, and therefore cannot be this Circumcision, unless he resolves all into the *Quakers* internal Baptism only. This Circumcision is oppos'd to the *Jewish* in this respect, particularly, that theirs was made *with Hands*, and this *without*: but if he meant Baptism, it can no more be said to be made without Hands than the *Jews* Circumcision in the Flesh; and therefore the Christian Circumcision here intended must have this difference from the *Jewish*, that it cannot be any thing external or relating to the Flesh, any farther than it is, as St. *Paul* afterwards says, *by putting off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh*; and serves to explain yet more particularly wherein this Circumcision made without

Hands conſiſts, *viz.* in ſuch internal Operation of GOD's Holy SPIRIT on the Mind o Man, whereby the Heart is purify'd from inward Filth and evil Inclinations. This is ſometime expreſs'd by putting off the Old Man, an putting on the New, *Epheſ.* iv. 22. and *Coloſſ.* ii 9, 10. and this, you know, is the Circumciſio St. *Paul* commonly oppoſes to the *Jewiſh*; a *Gal.* vi. 15. where arguing againſt the Law being then in force, he ſays, *Neither Circumciſio availeth any thing nor Uncircumciſion, but a ne Creature.* And again, *Rom.* ii. 29. *Circumciſion i that of the Heart, in the Spirit.* Since then St. *Pa* ſo plainly ſpecifys the Circumciſion here meant and characterizes it by ſuch Marks as agree onl to the internal one of the Heart; and witha conſtantly oppoſes this Circumciſion of the Hear to the *Jewiſh*, and never mentions a third: wha can incline any Man, contrary to the Analogy o Scripture, the particular Signs expreſs'd in th Words, and without any neceſſity, to impoſe thi ſtrange Senſe on this ſingle Place of St. *Paul?*

The Circumciſion here call'd Chriſtian, muſt b either wholly internal or wholly external, or part ly both. It cannot be partly internal, and partl external (which our Author pretty plainly aſſerts) becauſe, if it conſiſts of theſe two Parts, on whereof may be perform'd without Hands, an the other not, it can't be call'd Circumciſio without Hands; for, in order to make it com pleat, another part is neceſſary which muſt b perform'd with Hands, and what is true of an one part cannot be deny'd of the whole: an therefore, if the Chriſtian Circumciſion does bu partly conſiſt of what muſt be perform'd wit Hands, it is not a Circumciſion without Hands which is directly contrary to St. *Paul*'s Aſſertion And our Adverſarys will grant, this Circumciſio

can'

can't be wholly external; it remains therefore that it must be a Circumcision wholly internal, and consequently it can't be Baptism.

Here Mr. *Wall* tells us, *the Antients were wont to call Baptism* the Circumcision done without Hands. By this Information doubtless he hopes to persuade some that St. *Paul* calls it so too, because the inward Part was perform'd without Hands. Does Mr. *Wall* mean, that for this Reason, the outward Part was call'd Circumcision without Hands? If he does not mean so, he trifles, for 'tis of the outward Ceremony we are disputing; and if he does mean so, we have a greater Deference for St. *Paul* than to think he talks at such a rate, and a more honourable Opinion of the Antients than to suppose they cou'd be so grosly absurd as to say, the external Ceremony of Baptism was perform'd without Hands. The Passages of the Antients our Author refers to, I have consulted particularly, and I'm sure they say no such thing.

Besides, if they, and even St. *Paul* too, did commonly speak of Baptism as Mr. *Wall* pretends, how does this affect Infant-Baptism? Which way can he contrive an Inference to prove from thence that Infants are to be baptiz'd? It must be thus: If Baptism succeeds to us instead of Circumcision, then it follows, as Infants were order'd under the Law to receive the *Jewish* Circumcision, so now, tho it be not order'd, they must be circumcis'd under the Gospel, with the Christian Circumcision; that is, they must be baptiz'd. I have propos'd the Argument very fairly; and yet you may observe, Sir, how plainly it points us to the Solution which is contain'd in it. For there is this difference however, that Infants were order'd to be circumcis'd under *Moses*; but were not order'd to be

circumcis'd, that is, baptiz'd, under CHRIST: therefore I anſwer, under *Moſes* they ought to be circumcis'd, becauſe it was expreſly order'd; but under CHRIST, they are not to be baptiz'd, becauſe it is not order'd. So great a difference in the two Inſtitutions, ſhou'd be thought enough to juſtify ſo neceſſary a difference in the Practice. For the Parallel between Circumciſion and Baptiſm failing in this particular, the Argument drawn from it, which can't extend beyond the Parallel 'tis founded on, muſt alſo fail.

But farther: The Principle upon which the Pædobaptiſts go in arguing from this Topick, muſt be this, That what was done and obſerv'd in reſpect to Circumciſion under the Law, muſt be done and obſerv'd now in reſpect to Baptiſm under the Goſpel. If any plain Intimation cou'd be found, that Infants particularly are to be initiated now by Baptiſm, as formerly they were by Circumciſion, the Diſpute wou'd be at an end, and we need go no farther back: but ſince there is no ſuch particular Inſtruction, the whole muſt at laſt depend upon the general Principle mention'd.

Now if this be falſe, as no Man that reads it can deny but it is, then all that is built upon it muſt of courſe fall to the Ground.

Some of the Conſequences of this Principle are theſe:

1. Circumciſion was to be perform'd on the eighth Day preciſely; it was not to be defer'd longer upon any pretence, nor to be adminiſtred before, tho in the utmoſt danger of Death: accordingly, the *Jews* ſuffer'd their Children to die uncircumcis'd rather than do it before the time. Baptiſm therefore, by this Rule, muſt be always adminiſtred on the eighth Day preciſely, and neither before nor after on any account whatever.

And

And yet this is contrary to the Opinion and Practice of the Pædobaptists.

2. But what more immediately affects our present Dispute, is to observe, that the Females were not to be circumcis'd, and therefore now they are not to be baptiz'd; for those only, who were to be circumcis'd then, are the Subjects of Baptism now: and this is not only the Principle our Antagonists go upon, but their very Argument too. And therefore, if it proves Infants are proper Subjects from the Analogy, it equally proves the Male-Infants only are proper Subjects. If one was to follow the Argument in every particular, what confus'd Work wou'd it make?

In a word, then, it undoubtedly follows, That whatever Principle leads to such wild, extravagant Conclusions, is absurd, and ought to be disown'd.

But now, if Mr. *Wall* and the Pædobaptists will grant, that we are not to judg from the Subjects of Circumcision, precisely to those of Baptism, they give up their own Argument; or if they will stand by this Argument, they must deny Baptism to Females. But I know they will depart from the Rule in these Cases, and we claim the same Allowance to depart from it in the other too.

But they'll tell us the Apostles vary'd in these and such like Particulars, which is Warrant enough for them to do so too: they baptiz'd not Males only, but Females also, *Men and Women.* All this is very true; and the Apostles vary'd also in another Particular, *viz.* that whereas Infants were us'd to be circumcis'd, they admitted none but the Adult to Baptism. And hence we infer, that they did not make Circumcision their Pattern in any thing relating to Baptism: Why then shou'd our Adversarys plead for any Agreement between

theſe two Symbols, only in this Circumſtance? for they allow the Apoſtles obſerv'd no Agreement between 'em in any other Particular. And does it not at laſt from all plainly appear, that it is with the greateſt Reaſon we aſſert the Scripture and antient Chriſtians do not pretend to run a Parallel between Circumciſion and Baptiſm; and that, if they had in ſome reſpects, it cou'd not be concluded from thence that Infants are to be baptiz'd? All the Objections and Pretences about Circumciſion therefore muſt be manifeſtly invalid; and I am perſuaded, if the Clergy themſelves were to conſider the Matter more deliberately, they wou'd be aſham'd of all they have urg'd from this Head.

Let us proceed now to our Author's next Citation from St. *Juſtin*, which is that Part of the *firſt Apology*, wherein the Martyr gives the *Roman* Emperour an Account of the Chriſtian Initiation by Baptiſm. It is too long to be tranſcrib'd: you may read it in St. *Juſtin* himſelf, or in Mr. *Wall*'s Hiſtory; for 'tis a noble Piece of Antiquity, and indeed ſo is the whole Apology. If this made for Pædobaptiſm, it wou'd be very conſiderable, and do a great deal more than has been yet done, in the Argument of Antiquity: but Mr. *Wall* himſelf confeſſes it does not prove Infants are to be baptiz'd, and therefore ſuppoſes his Readers will wonder what he means by producing it here; in anſwer to which he tells us, he does not produce it for that purpoſe. St. *Juſtin* introduces the Account he gives of Baptiſm thus; *leſt*, ſays he, *if I ſhou'd leave out this, I might ſeem to deal unfairly in ſome part of my Apology.* If he was ſo cautious then, not to ſeem unfair, in hiding any thing from the Powers before whom he pleaded; 'tis ſtrange he ſhou'd entirely omit, without the leaſt Intimation, ſo important an Article as the Cuſtom

Custom of baptizing Infants, if it had been practis'd at that time.

The Heathens were apt enough to charge the Christians with using Infants very barbarously: it concern'd St. *Justin* therefore not to give any Umbrage, by seeming to avoid the mentioning of 'em. So careful an Apologist wou'd certainly have taken occasion to mention 'em, and describe the Christians Treatment of 'em very exactly, in order to remove all Suspicions from the Emperour's Mind. When they were reported to murder Infants, or make some impious Use of their Blood, what cou'd possibly fortify the Suspicion more, than that so great a Man as St. *Justin* shou'd, in a publick and formal Apology, decline saying any thing at all of what they did to 'em? It was altogether necessary therefore for St. *Justin*, at least, to have taken some notice of Infants, if they had us'd any Ceremony about 'em; and therefore 'tis wrong in Mr. *Wall* to say, * *He had no occasion to speak of the Case of Infants.*

But supposing he had not, must he therefore describe Baptism in such a manner as cannot be at all applicable to the Case of Infants, as he has done? This wou'd have been directly deceiving the Emperour, who certainly understood St. *Justin*'s Account to be full and true of Baptism in general, and never imagin'd the Christians baptiz'd otherwise. But Mr. *Wall* supposes the Christian Church, at that time, had two Baptisms, as the Church of *England* has at present, namely one of Adult Persons, here describ'd by St. *Justin*, and another of Infants different from that. And therefore he intimates, that what St. *Justin* says here might agree to Adult Persons, but cannot be apply'd to the Case of Infants.

* Part I. pag. 15.

A Man that will take this Liberty, may ſay any thing with as much Reaſon. 'Tis true indeed, what St. *Juſtin* ſays can only be apply'd to Adult Baptiſm: but that the Martyr ſhou'd prevaricate with the Emperour, and not ſpeak of Baptiſm in general as adminiſtred to all, but only in ſome Caſes, is unworthy his Sincerity, and altogether an unreaſonable Conjecture: for St. *Juſtin*, I am ſure, affords him no ground for this Diſtinction, who with Primitive Candor and Simplicity, gives an impartial full Account of the Adminiſtration of Baptiſm in general, and ſo as to reach all Caſes. Upon theſe Conſiderations, I think, it muſt be plain to any impartial Judg, that if this Paſſage of St. *Juſtin* does not make for Infant-Baptiſm, but relates only to the Adult, by Mr. *Wall*'s own Confeſſion, then it muſt make ſtrongly againſt it: for had there been ſuch a thing as Infant-Baptiſm at that time, how eaſy had it been for St. *Juſtin*, and how neceſſary, to have ſaid, not only *they who are perſuaded and do believe*, &c. but alſo to have added, *together with their Infant Children, are baptiz'd?*

But there is another thing, even in the Words, which directly oppoſes Infant-Baptiſm; the Words I particularly refer to, our Author tranſlates thus: *And we have been taught by the Apoſtles this Reaſon for this Thing; becauſe we being ignorant of our firſt Birth, were generated by Neceſſity*, &c. *that we ſhou'd not continue Children of that Neceſſity and Ignorance, but of Will* (or Choice) *and Knowledg; and ſhou'd obtain Forgiveneſs of the Sins, in which we have liv'd, by Water*, &c. Nothing can be plainer than that the new Birth, together with the Remiſſion of Sins to be obtain'd by Water, is here ſaid to depend not upon any Neceſſity, or the Will of another, as our being born into this World did, but, on the contrary, on our own Wills,

Wills, or free Choice and Knowledg; for the Opposition lies here: We were at first generated *without our Knowledg or Choice*; but we must be regenerated, and obtain the Remission of our Sins by Water, *with* our own Knowledg and Choice. And this shews that Infants, who are not capable of that Knowledg and Choice, are consequently not capable of this Baptism: if they are to be baptiz'd, it must be without their Choice, as much as their first Generation was; which destroys St. *Justin*'s Opposition, and therefore must be thought inconsistent with his Notion of the Matter.

Or however, supposing this were not so plain, we are at least upon equal Terms with Mr. *Wall* as to this Passage, since he confesses it does not make *for* Infant-Baptism. One wou'd be apt to think therefore it was impertinently cited; but our Author tells us, he produces it upon these three Accounts.

1. *Because this is the most antient* and best *Account of the Way of Baptizing, next the Scripture*, &c. and he notes that many Christians of those Times had liv'd *in the Apostles Days*; intimating, their Way was the more likely to be the same with that of the Apostles: and if so, our Author must allow, that those who come nearest in Practice to this Account of St. *Justin*, are to be accounted most in the right, and to administer the Ordinance in the greatest Purity. Now it is plain to any who read St. *Justin*'s Words, especially when they are compar'd with what he says in other Places, that Baptism was at that time administred by dipping; the Consequence of which is, that not those who *sprinkle* or *pour*, but those who *dip* retain the true Apostolick Way.

In the next Place, St. *Justin* here mentions only Adult Persons, and elsewhere plainly excludes Infants

fants from being then baptiz'd in the Church; and ſays, that Adult Perſons only can or ought to be baptiz'd: and therefore again, not thoſe who admit Infants, but thoſe who admit Adult Perſons only, who actually believe, *&c.* agree exactly with St. *Juſtin* and the Chriſtian Church of his time, and conſequently with the Apoſtles too. Thus, from this firſt Note of Mr. *Wall*, it follows that the Antipædobaptiſts here in *England*, who dip the Adult only, are in the right; and that the Pædobaptiſts, whom he goes about to defend, are as wide of the Truth in theſe Points, as being directly contrary to it, can make 'em.

2. The ſecond (and perhaps the chief) Reaſon for Mr. *Wall*'s citing this Paſſage, is, *becauſe*, he fancys, *it ſhews that the Chriſtians of theſe Times us'd the word* Regeneration *for Baptiſm.* This Remark is providently laid down againſt a proper time; for you will find our Author has occaſion afterwards to prove this Aſſertion. But this Paſſage of St. *Juſtin* is far from doing him that ſervice he intends; for tho he talks of their being regenerated, and joins it pretty cloſely with their being baptiz'd, yet he does not ſay Baptiſm is Regeneration: but only intimates that they receiv'd, or compleated, or confirm'd, *&c.* that Regeneration by Baptiſm: and as he is ſpeaking only of Adult Perſons, he muſt doubtleſs mean ſome farther Regeneration than bare Waſhing. The Paſſage, I confeſs, is a little obſcurely expreſs'd; but however, in this Senſe only, it is agreeable with St. *Juſtin*'s Doctrine, as an Example or two may ſatisfy you.

In his Dialogue with *Trypho*, he ſays, * CHRIST

---

* Pag. 367 D. Ἀρχὴ πάλιν ἄλλα Γένος γέγονεν τῶν ἀναγκαίως καὶ διὰ Αὐτὸν δι' Ὕδατος καὶ Πίστεως, καὶ Ξύλου, &c.

is

is become the Head of another People, who are regenerated by him by Water, Faith, and the Tree, &c. As Mr. *Wall* argues, Regenerated here must signify *baptiz'd*; and then the Passage runs thus, which were *baptiz'd of him by Water, Faith and the Tree*, that is, the Cross. But when did our Saviour baptize by Water, *&c*? And what Sense is there in that Expression, baptize *by* Faith, *&c*? Regenerated plainly means something else, which, he says, was done by CHRIST; and therefore he cannot intend Baptism, which is not administred by CHRIST personally: or if Baptism is said to be administred by CHRIST, as it is done by his Command, and by his Disciples, as *John* iv. 1, 2. yet we are said here to be regenerated *by* or *thro* Water, as a Symbol, not as the thing it self; for it is not said *in Water*.

Besides, the Regeneration is plac'd in *Faith* and in the *Cross*, as well as in *Water*; and yet Faith, strictly speaking, is not Regeneration, but only a Means of it, and so likewise is Baptism, *&c*. And the Cross, or CHRIST's Sufferings, or what else may be thought is here intended by it, cannot be our Regeneration, but only a Means of it.

We have another plain Instance to this purpose in this very Apology, and but a little after the Words Mr. *Wall* transcribes; where speaking of the Sacred Supper, the Martyr says, * *Of which it is not lawful for any to partake, but such as believe the things we teach, and are baptiz'd for the Remission of their Sins, and Regeneration*, &c. This manifestly shews that St. *Justin* thought Baptism was for Regeneration, just as it is for the Remission of Sins; but as Baptism is not the Remission

* Pag. 97. E. Ἧς ἐξεν ἄλλῳ μεταχεῖν ἐξόν ἐστιν, ἢ τῷ πιστεύοντι ἀληθῆ εἶναι τὰ δεδιδαγμένα ὑφ' ἡμῶν, καὶ λουτρὸν τὸ ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ εἰς ἀναγέννησιν λελεγὸν, &c.

of

of Sins, ſo neither is it Regeneration. That the Martyr ſays, ὑπὲρ Ἀφέσεως, but εἰς Ἀναγέννησιν, is no Objection; for ὑπὲρ Ἀφέσεως is doubtleſs the ſame in Senſe with St. *Peter*'s εἰς Ἄφεσιν, *Acts* ii. 28. and therefore 'tis all one as if St. *Juſtin*, who was indeed not very exact in his Language, had ſaid εἰς Ἄφεσιν. It appears then from hence, St. *Juſtin* only thought that we, ſome how or other, obtain'd or ſeal'd, *&c.* our Regeneration by Baptiſm, as a Mean or Sign, *&c.* juſt as we alſo obtain Remiſſion of Sins thereby, but not that Baptiſm is Remiſſion of Sins or Regeneration: And therefore he is to be thus only underſtood, and not as our Author wou'd fain underſtand him.

3. The third Thing for which Mr. *Wall* cites this Paſſage of St. *Juſtin*, is, *becauſe*, ſays he, *we ſee by it that they underſtood that Rule of our* SAVIOUR, Except a Man, *&c. of Water-Baptiſm, and concluded from it, that without ſuch Baptiſm no Perſon cou'd come to Heaven.* But how ſtrangely does Mr. *Wall* treat his Readers? One while he wou'd have us believe St. *Juſtin* ſpeaks here only of Adult Perſons converted from Heatheniſm; but now you are, all on a ſudden, to ſuppoſe he means Infants as well as Adult: for Mr. *Wall*'s deſign in this Note, is, to have us believe that St. *Juſtin* aſſerts, no Perſon, whether Adult or Infant, can be ſav'd without Baptiſm. But upon Mr. *Wall*'s own Conceſſion (and 'tis alſo too manifeſt to be deny'd) the Martyr intends no ſuch thing, but only that all Adult Perſons who hear the Word preach'd and believe, for of ſuch only he ſpeaks, ought to be baptiz'd in order to their being made Partakers of the Kingdom.

The next Citation Mr. *Wall* produces out of this Father, is taken from the ſame Apology with the former, and he tranſlates it thus: *Several Perſons among us of* 60 *and* 70 *Years old, of both Sexes, who were*

were discipled to CHRIST *in their Childhood, do continue uncorrupted.* His Argument from these Words is this, that many were discipled to CHRIST *in* their Childhood, and therefore Children may be discipled; and the Word us'd by St. *Matthew*, *Chap.* xxviii. 19. which is the same as is us'd here, does not mean to *teach*, but to *disciple* in such manner as Children are capable of. Nay, if it be true, that St. *Justin* wrote this but 100 Years after St. *Matthew*, and that some Infants had been baptiz'd 70 Years before he wrote, it follows that Infants were baptiz'd within the Apostolick Age, and even while most of the Apostles were yet living. Which is a formidable Argument indeed; but I beg you, Sir, to observe the whole Force of it depends upon our Author's Misrepresentation of the Words, which is beyond excuse.

As to μαθητεύω I have largely prov'd from its Use in *Greek* Authors, from the Sense in which the Fathers understood the Commission, from most if not all the Versions, and from the Consent of several of the most Learned Criticks, that it necessarily includes Teaching in its Signification. The whole Stress of what our Author advances to the contrary from these Words of St. *Justin*, lies in the Sense of the Phrase, ἐκ παίδων; which Mr. *Wall*, that the Passage might serve his turn, has unfairly rendred *in their Childhood.* To convince therefore the most prejudic'd, I shall shew the Disingenuity of our Author's Version more largely than so obvious a Matter requires; for every body knows well enough that ἐκ παίδων signifys not *in* but *from their Childhood*, just as 'tis said of St. *Timothy*, ‖ *that from a Child*, or from his In-

‖ 2 Tim. iii. 15.

fancy,

fancy, as it ſtrictly ſignifys, he had *known the Holy Scriptures*; not that it can be thought he underſtood 'em in his Infancy, but only from his Infancy he had been training up in the knowledg of 'em.

So *Cicero* * ſpeaks of being *brought up in good Learning* (per omnem Pueritiam) *from one's tendereſt Infancy.* And in another Place, † ſpeaking of *Diodotus* the *Stoick*, he ſays, *under whom I ſtudy'd* (a Puero) *from a Child.* Inſtances of this kind are common; but I muſt confine my ſelf to the *Greek* Writers. *Laertius* ‖ ſays of *Xenocrates* the Dull, of *Chalcedon*, *that he ſtudy'd under* Plato (ἐκ νέου) *from his Infancy.* *Socrates* ſays of the *Dæmon* which attended him, ** *By ſome Divine Direction a certain* Dæmon *has continu'd to attend me, beginning from my Infancy* (ἐκ παιδὸς); and ſo *Ficinus* tranſlates it, *à prima Pueritia.* And thus alſo *Plutarch* †† ſays of *Cato Minor*, that he was obſerv'd (ἐκ παιδίου) *even from his Childhood, in his Voice, and Countenance, and in his Play, to be of an inflexible, moroſe, and obſtinate Diſpoſition.*

To add ſome Fathers of the Chriſtian Church too: *Origen* ſays, ‖‖ *They who are call'd to do the Works of the Kingdom of* God (ἐκ παίδων, ἢ πρώτης Ἡλικίας) *from their Childhood and earlieſt Days, are thoſe whom the Houſholder hir'd early in the Morning*, Matth. xx. 1, &c. And a little after, in the ſame Page, *They who have been faithful* (ἐκ παίδων) *from their Childhood, who have labour'd, and with pains have kept a Check upon the Extra-*

* Ad Heren. lib. 3. pag. 46. b.
† Academ. Quæſt. lib. 4. cap. 34. p. 302. b.
‖ Lib. 4. in Vit. ejus.
** Platon. Theag. pag. 93.
†† In ejus Vit. pag. 1393.
‖‖ In Matth. pag. 406. C.

vagancys

vagancys of Youth, think much that they shou'd receive no greater Reward than others, who were idle as to Religion till they grew old, and have receiv'd and done the Works of Faith but a little time.

And *Theophilus Antiochenus* says, that *Epicurus* and the *Stoicks* taught Incest and Defilements with Mankind, and had fill'd the Librarys with those impure Doctrines, * *that Persons might* (ἐκ παίδων μανθάνειν) *from their Childhood learn and be educated to such unlawful Conversation.* In the *Pædagogue*, St. *Clemens Alexandrinus* defines *Pædagogy* to be † *a good Institution in Vertue from the Childhood* (ἐκ παίδων).

And to add yet some Instances from Scripture, *Samuel* ‖ tells the *Israelites* he had *walked before* them (ἐκ νεότητός) *from* his *Childhood, unto* that *Day.* And *Job* xxxi. 18. *I have guided her from my Mother's Womb.* The Royal Prophet *Psalm* lxxi. 5. *Thou art my Trust* (ἐκ νεότητός μου) *from my Youth.* And again, *Ver.* 17. *O* God, *thou hast taught me* (ἐκ νεότητός μου) *from my Youth.* And the young Man, whom Christ had directed to keep the Commandments, makes him this Answer, *Master, all these have I observ'd* (ἐκ νεότητός μου) *from my Youth,* Mark x. 20.

After all this I need make no farther Comment; for no Mortal can doubt but the Passage in St. *Justin* ought to have been render'd thus: *Several Persons among us of* 60 *or* 70 *Years of Age, of both Sexes, who have been train'd up in the Christian Religion, or instructed in* Christ *from their Childhood, do continue,* &c. And this is exactly as Mr. *Wall* himself too has render'd the same Phrase, when he was on another matter, and did

---

* Ad Autolyc. Lib. 3. pag. 120. D.
† Lib. 1. cap. 5. pag. 87. B.
‖ 1 Sam. xii. 2.

not

not think it weaken'd his Argument: 'tis in a Paſſage taken out of St. *Baſil's Exhortation to Baptiſm*, which our Author cites and tranſlates *Part* I. *pag.* 100. thus: *When you have been* (ἐκ Νηπίε) *from a Child catechiz'd in the Word, are you not yet acquainted with the Truth?* As in this Place St. *Baſil*, by our Author's own Confeſſion, ſpeaks to ſuch as had been *catechiz'd from their Childhood*; ſo St. *Juſtin*, in the other, ſpeaks of ſuch as had been *inſtructed from their Childhood.* And therefore our Author has dealt here a little unfairly with St. *Juſtin*; and it's plain that theſe Words, with the other Paſſages he cites from that Father, are really nothing to his purpoſe.

I ſhou'd now, Sir, ſhew you that St. *Juſtin* is ſo far from ſaying any thing in favour of Infant-Baptiſm, that he frequently enough uſes Expreſſions and Reaſonings, which declare he believ'd nothing of the Matter. But, as I am to anſwer Mr. *Wall*, my Buſineſs is only to confute his Arguments, which I hope you think I have fairly done hitherto.

Next follows St. *Irenæus*, in our Author's Quotations; and here we are to attack the ſtrongeſt Hold of our Adverſarys. But, by the way, let us obſerve that Mr. *Wall* confeſſes, *this is the firſt expreſs mention that we have met with of Infants baptiz'd.* Now this being wrote by his own Confeſſion about 180 Years after Christ, all that has been cited before that time, can't ſignify much; and the Baptiſm of Infants does not appear to have been practis'd, at beſt, till about the latter End of the ſecond Century. Nor have the Pædobaptiſts yet prov'd it was practis'd then; for this Paſſage from *Irenæus* no more proves it, than you ſee the other earlier Citations have done.

It's

It's true, many People have thought this Passage *plain* and *full* to the purpose: for what, say they, can be more express than these Words, *He came to save all Persons by Himself; all I mean, who by Him are regenerated unto* GOD, *Infants and little ones, and Children, and Youths, and elder Persons?* For as Infants are expresly mention'd here, and said to be sav'd by CHRIST, by being regenerated unto GOD by him: this they say must be thought an unexceptionable Instance, that Infant-Baptism was spoken of as a thing commonly practis'd in St. *Irenæus*'s time.

But to give this Passage the weight they pretend it has, they ought to have prov'd that St. *Irenæus* does certainly say thus; which is very doubtful upon two Accounts. 1. It's question'd whether the Passage be genuine; or rather it seems to be undeniably spurious. Cardinal *Baronius* * observ'd this above 100 Years ago; and, I think, the Reasons he gives have never been answer'd yet.

1. He notes, that the latter Part of the Chapter, from whence the Words are taken, contradict the Beginning; for to say CHRIST was baptiz'd at about 30, and to enumerate three Passovers after that, in the last of which he suffer'd, is as plain an Argument that CHRIST suffer'd about 33, as can be desir'd: and yet, in the latter Part of the same Chapter, 'tis pretended CHRIST liv'd till above 50. If St. *Irenæus* was guilty of so palpable a Contradiction, he must have been strangely inconsiderate, and not to be trusted in any Case; and then his Testimony, tho ever so full, is justly contemn'd. But since both Sides agree, the Holy Father cou'd not fall into so gross a Blunder: I infer, with the Cardinal, the latter Part of this Chapter is not his.

* Annal. Eccles. An. 34.

Caſaubon * quarrels with *Baronius* upon this occaſion; but ſays nothing to defend the Paſſage. And what *Petavius* † has offer'd againſt him, which is the moſt I have ſeen, amounts to nothing, if duly conſider'd. He owns all the Cardinal urges; for indeed St. *Irenæus* is expreſs as to the time of our LORD's Baptiſm, and the three Paſſovers mention'd, which were after his Baptiſm: but becauſe St. *Irenæus* does not particularly ſay, the firſt of theſe three did commence with the next after his Baptiſm, therefore *Petavius* imagines St. *Irenæus* thought there were ſeveral Paſſovers between his Baptiſm, and the firſt of theſe three, which are mention'd. But ſince he does not attempt to prove this, 'tis too wild and fanciful a Conjecture to paſs, and founded purely on *Petavius*'s Imagination. And the only Reaſon *Petavius* has to imagine this, he himſelf tells us, is, becauſe, ‖ *otherwiſe St.* Irenæus *contradicts himſelf:* which is very pleaſant indeed. For this is the Cardinal's Aſſertion, and *Petavius* ſhou'd not have ſuppos'd the contrary, and then argu'd from his Suppoſition; for that's only begging the Queſtion. In ſhort, *Petavius* allows the whole Force of the Cardinal's Argument, that the Beginning and End of this Chapter are contradictory, unleſs it can be prov'd to be probable, that theſe three Paſſovers are not the three immediately following upon our LORD's Baptiſm: which I don't ſee how any Man will ever be able to do.

2. Another Reaſon the Annaliſt gives, to render this Place of *Irenæus* ſuſpected, is, that the Author of the laſt Part of the Chapter, wou'd con-

* Exercitat. 16. ad An. 34. num. 142.
† Animad. in Epiphan. Hæreſ. 51.
‖ Alioqui conſtare ipſe ſibi non poteſt.

firm ſo manifeſt a Falſhood, by the Authority of the Antients, who he pretends receiv'd it immediately from St. *John* himſelf and other Apoſtles: for *Baronius* thinks the Fancy is too notoriouſly falſe and ridiculous (as likewiſe all Men will allow it is) to be contain'd in the Scriptures, or affirm'd by any of the Antients *Irenæus* cou'd refer to, and more eſpecially by St. *John* and other Apoſtles, who cou'd not be miſtaken in a Matter, which even we at this time know ſo well.

Mr. *Dodwell* *, not with any apparent Deſign upon this Argument of the Cardinal's, but in Anſwer to ſome others, who make a different Uſe of the Paſſage, wou'd have us believe that St. *John*, &c. from whom *Pſeudo-Irenæus* pretends to have deriv'd his Opinion, only judg'd by his Countenance, that our LORD was arriv'd to the beginning, at leaſt, of *old Age*; which, St. *Irenæus*, according to the Diviſion of Ages in his time, underſtood to be toward 50 Years. But, if the Fathers are capable of ſuch groſs Errors in *Fact*, all Mr. *Dodwell* ſays ſo learnedly in that Diſſertation, will ſignify nothing: becauſe, notwithſtanding his Diſtinction, if by *Reaſoning*, or any other way, they miſtake and aſſert what is in *Fact* falſe, their Teſtimony cannot be rely'd on even as to *Facts*; the Point Mr. *Dodwell* ſo ſtrenuouſly labours to carry. And how unlikely is it that St. *John* and the Apoſtles ſhould content themſelves with barely gueſſing at our SAVIOUR's Age by his Looks; when nothing was more eaſy than to know it more exactly, and upon better grounds? Nay, they cou'd not but know it; for doubtleſs they had often heard, and as often related, the wonderful manner of his Birth,

* Diſſertat. in Irenæum I. §. 45. pag. 81, 82.

with the ſtrange Events that attended it. The time of *Auguſtus*'s taxing the whole World, and *Herod*'s barbarous Maſſacre of the Children, *&c.* were freſh in their Memory: and what is more common or natural, than for People to enquire how long ago ſuch or ſuch a thing, they are told of, was done? And that they ſhou'd not have this Curioſity in ſo important a Concern as the Birth, *&c.* of CHRIST, is altogether incredible.

'Tis not to be ſuppos'd therefore, that St. *Irenæus* receiv'd, or ſays he receiv'd, ſo falſe an Account of our LORD's Age from the Apoſtles: and conſequently that Part of the Chapter, as it now ſtands, is none of his.

3. To the Reaſons of *Baronius* it may be added, that St. *Irenæus* cou'd not but know better, than to think CHRIST arriv'd ſo much as near the 40th Year, much leſs the 50th. The Apoſtles certainly knew the time of our LORD's meritorious Paſſion; for they were diſconſolate Eye-witneſſes of it. And the time of his Birth they cou'd no more be ignorant of, than any true *Engliſhman* can forget the happy Period when his late Glorious Majeſty bravely reſcu'd three Nations from Popery and Arbitrary Power, and ſecur'd the Throne to our preſent moſt Gracious Queen, whoſe Succeſſion is the greateſt Bleſſing that has follow'd upon that generous Attempt; in that it makes all firm and laſting during Her Sacred Majeſty's Life at leaſt: which may GOD of his infinite Goodneſs lengthen out by a numerous Addition of happy Years, and at laſt reward Her ſteddy Piety and Juſtice with an inconceivably happier Eternity.

If then the Apoſtles knew the time of our LORD's Birth, and the time of his Death, of

con-

conſequence they knew how old he was at that time. And they with whom they immediately convers'd, had undoubtedly often heard 'em relate the whole, and cou'd not but know then the preciſe times when he was born, and when he dy'd. Thus we find two of the Diſciples, as they were going to *Emaus*, Luke xxiv. 14. *talking together of all the things that had happen'd*; and afterwards, *ver.* 21. noting to the ſuppos'd Stranger the particular time they were done.

Now St. *Irenæus* himſelf tells us he had ſeen and learnt many things from ſome who had convers'd with the Apoſtles. There is a very remarkable Fragment of his Epiſtle to *Florinus* to this purpoſe, preſerv'd by *Euſebius*, which runs thus: * *I ſaw you when I was a young Man in the* Lower Aſia *with* Polycarp, *making a notable Figure in the Emperour's Court, and endeavouring to gain his Eſteem; for I remember what was done then, better than what has been done in later times (for what we learn in our Youth grows up with our Mind, and ſinks deeply into it). So that I cou'd deſcribe the Place where the Bleſſed* Polycarp *ſat and diſcours'd, his going out and coming in, his manner of Life, and his Perſon; his Diſcourſes to the People, and the familiar Converſe he ſaid he had with St.* John *and others who had ſeen the* LORD; *and how he rehears'd their Diſcourſes, and what he had heard them who had been Eye-witneſſes of the Word of Life relate of our* LORD, *and of his Miracles and Doctrines, in all exactly agreeing with the Scriptures. And theſe things, which then by the Goodneſs of* God *offer'd to me, I heard diligently, and committed 'em*

* Euſeb. Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Lib. 5. cap. 20.

to Memory, not in Paper, but in my Heart. And by the Grace of GOD, *I do continually run 'em over in my Mind distinctly.*

In an Age so nigh the Apostles, Persons who had the Advantage which St. *Irenæus*, by his own Words, appears to have had, cannot possibly be suppos'd to have been ignorant of our LORD's Age: for it is observable in the Passage just now translated, that St. *Irenæus* had taken such particular notice of *Polycarp*, that he remembred even the very Place he sat in, and all the most minute Circumstances; and very diligently heard the Accounts he gave of his Conversation with the Apostles, and of the many things he had heard 'em relate of the LORD and his Doctrines. And as the Father attended to all these things with the utmost eagerness, so he had treasur'd 'em up in his Memory with the greatest Care and Fidelity. And is it to be imagin'd that Persons, so zealous and so nice in their Observations, shou'd not keep a tolerable Account of the Age, that is, the Birth and Passion of their ador'd REDEEMER?

Besides, as it might easily be, so it was commonly known from the Censual Rolls of *Augustus*, both at what Time, and in what Place our LORD was born. *Justin Martyr*, in his Apology to the Emperour, appeals to these Rolls; and *Tertullian*, speaking of 'em, as things sufficiently known, calls 'em * *faithful Witnesses of the Birth of CHRIST.* And, in the beginning of Christianity, before and after St. *Irenæus*, in the Disputes with their Adversarys, the Christians were wont to prove from the Prophets, when CHRIST was to appear; which occasion'd 'em to observe and mark

* In Marcionem, Lib. 4. cap. 7. Fidelissimum testem Dominicæ Nativitatis, &c.

the

the time of the LORD's Birth, and likewise the time of his Passion, as we see *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, &c. have done: and in defending the Truth of Facts 'tis very usual, and indeed can hardly be avoided, to mention, among other Circumstances, the Time and Place, *&c.* with some Care, tho not with the utmost Exactness. So the Scripture notes our LORD was about 30 when he was baptiz'd, and the like: now St. *Irenæus* must be suppos'd to have seen and read several of those Discourses, and cou'd not but be inform'd from them in some tolerable measure of the LORD's Age; nay, he wou'd certainly have consider'd 'em in particular, the better to confute the Hereticks he wrote against, upon such an occasion, and not negligently have expos'd himself to the scorn of his Adversarys, who wou'd doubtless have us'd all diligence to shew how grossly he argu'd, and how much he was mistaken, if he had set down things at random, and made a false Computation.

4. St. *Irenæus*'s own Words prove he was not guilty of so great an Error as this spurious Passage wou'd fasten upon him. For in another Place, where he is not so much concern'd to be exact, he justly places the LORD's * Birth about the 41st Year of *Augustus*: now if CHRIST liv'd but 40 Years from thence, he cou'd not be crucify'd in the Reign of *Tiberius*, nor under *Pontius Pilate*; for *Tiberius* dy'd 37 Years after the Birth of CHRIST, and *Pilate* was remov'd from his Government of *Judea*, at least, a Year before, for he was made Governour in the Twelfth † of

* Lib. 3. cap. 25. Natus est enim DOMINUS noster circa primum & quadragesimum Annum *Augusti* Imperii, &c.

† Euseb. Chronic. pag. 262.

Tiberius, and continu'd but ten Years *; ſo that he was diſplac'd one Year before *Tiberius* dy'd, and conſequently in the 36th Year from the Birth of CHRIST: and certainly St. *Irenæus*, who was acquainted with Times more remote, cou'd not but know this from *Joſephus* whom he had read.

It is not to be imagin'd, the Time of acting that bloody Tragedy on the LORD of Life, cou'd be ſo ſoon and ſo much forgotten by his moſt zealous Adorers, and thoſe who profeſs'd to worſhip him as GOD †. Or however, they muſt needs remember the preciſe Time of ſo famous an Event as the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*: when every body knows it happen'd under *Veſpaſian*; and in *Irenæus*'s days they cou'd not but know it was in that Emperour's ſecond Year; nay farther, that it was on the firſt of *September*, and on the ſeventh Day of the Week too, as well as we do now: for St. *Irenæus* wrote but about 100 Years after it, and was an old Man too when he wrote. Now from theſe things nothing was eaſier than to compute the time of the Paſſion.

From the Paſſion, to the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, 'twas generally allow'd by the Primitive Fathers, were about forty or forty-two Years, as is plain from *Euſebius* ||, *Clemens Alexandrinus* **, *Origen* ††, &c. And *Phlegon*, who wrote a little before St. *Irenæus* was born, as he is cited by *Origen* |||, ſays expreſly, that *about*

* Joſeph. Antiquitat. Judaic. Lib. 18. cap. 5.

† Plin. Lib. 10. Epiſt. 103, 104. Et apud Euſeb. Chronic. pag. 209.

|| Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. 3. cap. 7. Et Chronic. pag. 206.

** Strom. Lib. 1. pag. 340. B.

†† Orig. adv. Celſum, Lib. 4. pag. 174.

||| Tractat. 29. in Matth. pag. 138, 139.

40 *Years from the* 15*th of* Tiberius, (in which St. *Luke* ſays our LORD was baptiz'd, being 30 Years of Age) *the City and Temple of* Jeruſalem *were deſtroy'd.* St. *Irenæus* then can't be ſuppos'd ignorant of this, no more than Mr. *Wall* can be thought not to know the time when the Reformation began in *England*; or that it was under *Hen.* VIII. or how long it is ſince that King's Reign.

But if St. *Irenæus* knew our LORD's Paſſion was about 40 Years before the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, he cou'd not make CHRIST to have liv'd above 31 Years or thereabout. For it's plain from the beſt Hiſtorys, and from the Obſervations of Eclipſes, that *Auguſtus* dy'd 14 Years after the Birth of CHRIST; after which *Tiberius* reign'd 23 Years, and conſequently dy'd *anno* 37. Thence *Caligula* reign'd about 3 Years and a half, and therefore dy'd *anno* 41. *Claudius* ſucceeded for about 13 Years and a half, and dy'd *anno* 54. *Nero* reign'd about 14 Years, and therefore dy'd *anno* 68. *Galba* reign'd about 7 Months, and therefore dy'd about *anno* 69. *Otho* 3 Months, and dy'd likewiſe *anno* 69. *Vitellius* reign'd but 8 Months, and dy'd about the beginning of 70. *Veſpaſian* ſucceeded him; in whoſe ſecond Year the City was deſtroy'd; that is, about the Year 71: but if our LORD ſuffer'd 40 Years before that, by ſubſtracting 40 from 71, you have 31, about which Age he was crucify'd.

There may indeed be ſome Variations in computing theſe Periods; but it's impoſſible to find any ground, eſpecially for thoſe ſo near the Times we ſpeak of, to reckon CHRIST was near Fifty when he died.

Clemens ‖ *Alexandrinus* calculates very much after this manner, with but little difference. And to

‖ Strom. lib. 1. pag. 339.

ſuppoſe

ſuppoſe St. *Irenæus* ignorant of theſe neceſſary Steps, which were then ſo very eaſy to be known, *viz.* about 60 or at moſt 70 Years after the Events, is as abſurd a Suppoſition as can well be, and makes this Father a moſt negligent Writer. *Joſephus* alone, whom he had read; or *Phlegon*, who wrote but in *Adrian*'s Time, cou'd have furniſh'd him with Particulars ſufficient to judg of the LORD's Age at his Paſſion, as appears by the following Series extracted from *Joſephus*.

	Years.		
(a) *Auguſtus* reign'd	57		
(b) *Tiberius*	20	5	3
(c) *Caligula*	3	8	0
(d) *Claudius*	13	8	30
(e) *Nero*	13	0	8
(f) *Galba*	0	7	7
(g) *Otho*	0	3	2
(h) *Vitellius*	0	8	5
And (i) *Titus* deſtroy'd *Jeruſalem* in the ſecond Year of his Father *Veſpaſian*	2	0	0
The Total is	111	4	24

Now St. *Irenæus*, as I have before noted, places the Birth of CHRIST in the 41ſt of *Auguſtus*; therefore taking 41 from 111, there will remain 70 for the time between the Birth of CHRIST

(a) Antiq. lib. 18. cap. 3.
(b) Ibid. cap. 8.
(c) Ibid. lib. 19. cap. 2.
(d) De Bello Judaic. lib. 2. cap. 11.
(e) Ibid. lib. 5. cap. 6.
(f) Ibid.
(g) Ibid. cap. 8.
(h) Ibid. cap. 13.
(i) Ibid. lib. 7. cap. 18.

and

and the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*: and then ſuppoſing this Deſtruction, according to the common Account, to have been about 40 Years after the Paſſion, CHRIST muſt have ſuffer'd at near 30 Years of Age. Or to give the matter ſhorter, the Scriptures aſſure us CHRIST ſuffer'd under *Pontius Pilate*: now he govern'd *Judea* no longer than *Tiberius* reign'd, and not ſo long; and *Tiberius*, according to *Joſephus*, reign'd 20 Years: to which if we add the 14 Years CHRIST liv'd under *Auguſtus*, they amount to no more than 34 Years, if CHRIST had liv'd as long as *Tiberius* did. Or again, if *Tiberius* reign'd but 20 Years, and CHRIST was about 30 in *Tiberius*'s 15th, as St. *Luke* aſſures us, then he cou'd not be above 4 or 5 and thirty at moſt when he died; but as he died under *Pilate* who was diſmiſs'd the Government a Year ſooner, ſo CHRIST muſt have died a Year younger. So that it was not poſſible for St. *Irenæus*, which way ſoever he went to work, to ſtretch the Time of our LORD's Life upon Earth to near 40, much leſs 50 Years, as the Author of the latter part of the Chapter, out of which the Pædobaptiſts cite the Words they build on, has inconſiderately done.

Mr. *Dodwell*, 'tis true, has endeavour'd to make the Opinion of CHRIST's being toward 50 Years old, the more excuſable, and likely to have been St. *Irenæus*'s, by ſhewing, * that he was nearer 40 than is generally believ'd: but if his Calculation be ever ſo exact, it can ſignify nothing in the preſent caſe, becauſe he agrees with us, that the time of the Paſſion was the 19th of *Tiberius*, and only ſets the time of his Birth ſomething backwarder than we do; which is not to be allow'd in this

* Differt. I. in Irenæum, §. 46. p. 82, *&c.*

Caſe,

Caſe, becauſe St. *Irenæus* himſelf has determin'd the time of his Birth to the 41ſt of *Auguſtus*; from which to the 19th of *Tiberius* is but 33 Years, according to Mr. *Dodwell* himſelf.

From all this therefore I think it muſt neceſſarily follow, that St. *Irenæus* cannot be reaſonably thought the Author of this part of that Chapter; for it can't fairly be imagin'd that a Man of his Learning and Integrity, was either incapable of making the neceſſary Computations, or ſo intolerably careleſs as to neglect 'em, eſpecially when he was profeſſedly treating the matter, and did not ſpeak of it by the by.

2. But in the ſecond Place 'tis doubtful whether St. *Irenæus* ſaid as our Adverſarys underſtand the Paſſage now, becauſe we have not his own Words, but only a Tranſlation of 'em, which may give 'em a quite different Face from what they had in the Original: and therefore if the Words be allow'd to have any weight at all, it can be but very little. And Tranſlators very often took a great Latitude, as ſeveral among the Antients have complain'd.

But as to this Tranſlation of St. *Irenæus* in particular, it is a very ſcandalous one, and altogether unworthy the Original. And this all learned Men confeſs, ſince it has been known to be a Tranſlation: the great *Scaliger* ſays, † *The Tranſlator was an Aſs, and had even leſs Learning than Ruffinus:* and yet one wou'd think no Man cou'd abuſe his Original more than 'tis known *Ruffinus* was wont to do. Monſieur *du Pin* calls it (*a*) a barbarous Verſion: and a little after, ſays, *the Verſion of the five Books againſt Hereſys, tho barba-*

† *Scaligerana*, pag. 213. L'Interprete d'Irenée eſt bien Aſne, il eſt plus indocte encore que Ruffin.

(*a*) Hiſt. Eccleſ. p. 67, 68.

rous

rous and full of Faults, &c. And in a Note he has added, he ſays, (*b*) *It was certainly compos'd by a Man who underſtood neither Language as he ought*; that is, neither the *Greek* in which St. *Irenæus* wrote, nor the *Latin*, into which he pretended to tranſlate. The learned Mr. *Dodwell* calls it, (*c*) *a fooliſh Tranſlation*; and the Author of it, (*d*) *a barbarous unskilful Tranſlator*, who, he ſays, has ſeveral times *miſtaken one Word for another, ſo as even to alter the Senſe very much from what the Author intended:* and he gives ſeveral Inſtances of it.

Dr. *Grabe*, the learned Editor of this Father, in the *Prolegomena* he has prefix'd to the late Edition, reckons it but a bad Tranſlation; and ſays, They who fancy St. *Irenæus* to have been the Tranſlator as well as the Author (*e*) *make that great Man unacquainted with his own Thoughts, or elſe they muſt ſay he has expreſs'd 'em very aukwardly.*

But beſides the Judgment of learned Men, the badneſs of the Verſion may be ſeen by comparing it with thoſe Fragments of the *Greek* which are ſtill preſerv'd.

In one place (*f*) where the Original and the Verſion diſagrees, Dr. *Grabe* thinks the Copy the Tranſlator made uſe of was corrupt: which however cou'd not well be ſo early as the Doctor (without any ground) ſuppoſes the Tranſlation to be made, namely, in St. *Irenæus*'s time, or ſoon after. I ſhou'd rather impute the Variation to the Tranſlator's Ignorance or Care-

(*b*) Pag. 71. Letter *k*.
(*c*) Differt. V. Sect. 4.
(*d*) Ibid. Sect. 5.
(*e*) Sect. 2. §. 3.
(*f*) Lib. 3. cap. 21. Not. a. pag. 250.

leſneſs

leſneſs; eſpecially ſince we have other undoubted Inſtances, how unequal he was to the Work he undertook.

In another place, (*g*) the Doctor thinks ſome Words which had been noted in the Margin, are now crept into the Text it ſelf: and elſewhere he very frequently finds fault with the Tranſlation. In the 25th Chapter of the 3d Book, inſtead of ποιήσαντος τὸ ΘΕΟΥ̃, the Interpreter ſeems to have read, not without very great Negligence to be ſure, ποιήσαντας τοῦτο ὅπερ ἐβούλετο; entirely perverting the Author's Senſe, as the Doctor has noted (*h*).

Again, St. *Irenæus* had ſaid, (*i*) *For ſince by a Tree we loſt it, (viz.* the Word of GOD) *by a Tree we have receiv'd it again*; (but the Tranſlator falſly renders it, *by a Tree it was again made manifeſt unto all) ſhewing the height, and length, and breadth, and depth* (this laſt Word is omitted in the Tranſlation) *which is in it: For* (the Tranſlator turns it *and*, and adds *as ſome of the Antients have ſaid) by a divine* (this Word the Tranſlator omits) *ſtretching out of the Hands, he gather'd two People under one Head, even the* FATHER; (the Tranſlator renders it, *two People under one* GOD; and then adds of his own, *two Hands, becauſe there were two People ſcatter'd to the ends of the Earth; but one middle Head) for GOD is one who is over all, and thro all, and in all.* The Tranſlation is different in this laſt Clauſe too; for it runs, *for one GOD is over all, thro all, and in us all.* In this one ſhort Paſſage, you ſee, there is abundance of liberty taken, and that ſeveral times the Senſe is chang'd.

(*g*) Ad Lib. 3. cap. 19. Not. b. pag. 245.
(*h*) Pag. 255. Not. b.
(*i*) Lib. 5. cap. 17. p. 426.

In

In another place, to give but one Instance more, the Translator has alter'd the Sense of the *Greek* very much. St. *Irenæus* reckons up the four Covenants GOD had made with Men in this manner: * *One after the Flood of* Noah, *in the Bow; the second, that of* Abraham, *in the Sign of Circumcision; the third, the giving of the Law by* Moses; *and the fourth, that of the Gospel, by our* LORD JESUS CHRIST. But the Translator reckons 'em up thus: *One with* Adam *before the Flood; the second with* Noah *after the Flood; the third, the giving of the Law under* Moses; *the fourth renews the Man, and comprehends all in it, which is by the Gospel, giving Men Wings, and raising 'em up into the heavenly Kingdom.* One wou'd think this cou'd not be pretended to be a Translation of St. *Irenæus*'s Sense, it is so different from it. But you may see what strange Work has been made with this Book, and how much the Translator, thro Ignorance, Negligence, and too much Liberty, has corrupted and abused this great Man's Work. And can any body, after all this, be satisfy'd barely from such a Translation, that he has, in any Case, the true Sense of St. *Irenæus*, without any Alteration? And much less shou'd any ground an Argument upon it. It must appear therefore very doubtful, at least, whether St. *Irenæus* ever spoke as the present Translation makes him do: for I have shewn, I think more than probably, that this part of the Chapter cou'd not be St. *Irenæus*'s; and that if it was, yet we can have no reason to depend on the Translator. And therefore Mr. *Wall* shou'd have secur'd the Passage from these Exceptions, if he intended to do his Cause any Service with it: for if St. *Irenæus* did not

* Lib. 3. cap. 11. pag. 223.

write

write those Words, or to that purpose exactly, whatever may be prov'd from 'em signifys nothing.

Nay, if Mr. *Wall* had prov'd beyond Contradiction, that the *Latin* Translation of the Passage he cites does punctually agree with what was in the *Greek* Original written by St. *Irenæus* himself; yet it wou'd still have been liable to the following weighty Exceptions, which effectually take off the force of the Argument the Pædobaptists raise from it: it depending entirely on these two Suppositions, That by *regenerated* is meant *baptiz'd*, and by *Infants* such as we now call Infants in Age, and but new-born: For it's very plain, that if the Passage does not speak of such Infants, or if it does not speak of baptizing 'em, it proves nothing.

1. In the first place then, there is no reason to think the Word *regenerated* here means *baptiz'd*. Mr. *Wall* indeed tells us, † that such as are at all acquainted with the Books of those Ages, cannot doubt but the Word *Regeneration*, in the usual Phrase of those Times, signify'd *Baptism*: but one wou'd think by this Assertion, that our Author is not much acquainted with the Books of those Times himself; and that he had never read 'em, when he says, the antient Christians ‖ *never use the word* regenerate *or* born again, *but that they mean or denote by it Baptism*; for nothing can be more apparently false, as I shall shew.

But first, we must observe our Author begins this matter something higher: and as he pretends to have found Baptism practis'd by the *Jews* in and before Christ's time; so he likewise tells

† Part I. pag. 18.
‖ Introd. pag. 22.

us

us, † they call'd that *Baptism*, *Regeneration*; and from them CHRIST himself and all Christians borrow'd not only the thing, but also that way of speaking of it.

But I have prov'd, as plainly as it can be expected such a thing shou'd be prov'd, that the *Jews* had no such Initiatory Baptism; and consequently, they cou'd not call it by that Name. Or however, if it shou'd be allow'd they had such a Baptism, I believe they no where call it *Regeneration*, whatever Mr. *Wall* pretends. I am sure there is nothing like it in the Passages he cites. Indeed, Proselytes were thought new Men, and the *Talmud* and *Maimonides*, as our Author quotes 'em, say, *they were like Children new-born:* but the same is said of *a Slave that's made free* too, even in the same Words of *Maimonides*; and yet Slaves were not made free by this pretended initiatory Baptism. So that tho Proselytes were accounted as Children new-born, because they were now in a different State from what they were in before; yet where is it said, or so much as intimated, that Baptism was call'd or thought a Regeneration? It does not follow, because they are said to be *as* new-born Babes, that they were said likewise to *be* new-born; nor if they were said to be new-born, that they meant nothing but Baptism by that new Birth. Why shou'd not Circumcision, or offering Sacrifice, be the Regeneration, as well as Baptism? Or indeed, Why shou'd we say, either of 'em were call'd Regeneration, when the Passage our Author goes upon, intimates no such thing?

And how trifling must it be from these Fancys, to go about to explain what the Scriptures

† Introd. pag. 21.

mean by the *new Birth* and the *new Creature?* Nay, if all the Rabbins did assert what our Author pretends to say from 'em; is it becoming a Christian Divine to forsake the Scriptures, to follow the Rabbins? By this new Creation the Scriptures, 'tis plain, mean the *renewing of the Mind*, Rom. xii. 2. and *the renewing of the HOLY GHOST*, Tit. iii. 5. It's strange it shou'd ever come into any one's Head to give so perverse a Turn to the Words, *If any Man be in CHRIST he is a new Creature*; as to say, they mean he *is baptiz'd:* but surely no body will think St. *Paul* cou'd talk at this poor rate. 'Tis more natural to understand 'em, as he perhaps more plainly runs the same Argument, *Coloss.* iii. 9, 10. to intend, that such as were in CHRIST, and risen with him, *Ver.* 1. were become new Creatures, by *putting off the old Man with his Deeds, and putting on the new Man, which is renew'd in Knowledg, after the Image of Him that created him.* And beside this, the Scriptures know of no other Regeneration that we are here capable of.

Tho this is undoubtedly the true Scripture Notion of Regeneration, as appears from the places where the Word *Regenerate*, &c. is us'd, or Regeneration spoken of; yet Mr. *Wall* is pleas'd to call it, with some seeming Contempt, the *modern Notion*, and he appropriates it to some late *English Writers*: and the reason is plain; for if it shou'd once come to be thought as antient as the Scriptures and earliest Writings, it might go very near to spoil the best Argument for Pædobaptism our Adversarys can find in all Antiquity, which is this of St. *Irenæus*. But however they may dread the Consequences, it's certain Regeneration meant this spiritual Birth, and nothing short of a real personal Change.

Of

Of all the Paſſages in Scripture where *regenerate, &c.* is us'd, I don't remember any are diſputed but theſe two, *viz.* the Words of our LORD, *John* iii. 5. and thoſe of St. *Paul*, Tit. iii. 5. And theſe indeed are by our Author cited as Inſtances to confirm his Senſe: but what ground he has, beſide a ſtrong Imagination, I don't ſee. The Words of our SAVIOUR are a little obſcure, ſince the prevailing of Infant-Baptiſm; for Baptiſm being never adminiſter'd but to Perſons ſuppos'd to be regenerated, of which it was the Sign, *&c.* therefore all that were baptiz'd were ſpoken of as regenerated; and then Infants being allow'd to be baptiz'd, they muſt be taken to be regenerated too, and ſo Baptiſm and Regeneration come to be taken, by ſome People, for the ſame thing. And indeed, upon this Notion it was pretty eaſy to miſtake our SAVIOUR's Words: but this Miſtake may be as eaſily ſeen; for our LORD does not ſay, *born of Water alone*, but *born of Water and the* SPIRIT. He does not ſpeak of two new Births, one by Water, and one by the SPIRIT; but only of one which was to be of Water and the SPIRIT in conjunction. And thus then, without going any farther, it appears, that tho we may charitably hope, and ſay, all who are regularly baptiz'd are regenerated, yet the baptizing in Water is not the regenerating; becauſe that other Part, *viz.* of the *Spirit*, is at leaſt equally requir'd to Regeneration: and therefore Baptiſm with Water is not Regeneration.

But we may ask farther, whether the new Birth CHRIST ſpeaks of, does peculiarly conſiſt in the external Adminiſtration by Water only, or in the internal Operations of the SPIRIT only, or in both together? Now that both Water and the SPIRIT are neceſſary in the Caſe our LORD is

ſpeaking of, is plain from the Words themſelves: and that the Regeneration really conſiſts but in one, and the other is only us'd as a Means, or the like, is, I think, full as plain.

For, as to the external Adminiſtration of Baptiſm by Water; it is ever in the Scriptures ſpoken of as a Symbol only, and Repreſentation of ſomething elſe of a more excellent Nature. This is ſo evident to all who read the Scriptures, that I need not go about to prove it: *Therefore we are buried with Him in Baptiſm into Death.* And the very Name of *Sacrament*, even according to the Notion given of it in the *Articles of the Church of England*, ‖ imports as much.

Now if to this it be added, that Baptiſm is no where call'd Regeneration, but that the internal Change of the Mind, *&c.* frequently is: That Baptiſm is not obtain'd by means of the SPIRIT; but on the contrary, the SPIRIT was wont to be obtain'd in the uſe of Baptiſm: methinks it ſhou'd be plain enough, that the Regeneration our LORD ſpoke of, was ſpiritual, to be ſignify'd and obtain'd, or the like, by the Symbol of Baptiſm in Water.

But beſides, our LORD's own Words put the matter out of doubt: for continuing his Diſcourſe on the ſame new Birth, he appropriates it wholly to the SPIRIT, and ſpeaks only of being born of the SPIRIT; for 'tis that only he oppoſes to the former fleſhly Birth, in the Words next immediately following, *Ver.* 6. which ſhews that was the only Birth he meant before; for how incoherent wou'd he elſe have been? When he had told *Nicodemus* of a certain new Birth, which puzzl'd his Underſtanding, to run from that, and

‖ *Article* 25.

talk

talk of quite another thing, cou'd not but have made him more confus'd; whereas CHRIST goes about to take off the Amazement, *Marvel not*, ſays He, *that I ſaid unto thee, you muſt be born again*, Ver. 7. and ſhews him, it's no wonder if he does not underſtand how it can be, ſince even in natural Cauſes, the Wind for Inſtance, he is forc'd to confeſs his Ignorance. And this makes it evident, that CHRIST ſpeaks of ſpiritual Regeneration, and no other: for had He by *born again* meant Baptiſm, that cou'd not have been ſo hard to be underſtood, nor have given our SAVIOUR occaſion to ſay, *marvel not*, &c. And eſpecially if it had been the Practice of the *Jews* to baptize their Proſelytes, and call that Baptiſm Regeneration, as 'tis pretended; how is it poſſible *Nicodemus* ſhou'd not underſtand a common Phraſe of his Mother-Tongue? CHRIST indeed wonders, that he being a Ruler in *Iſrael*, ſhou'd not better apprehend what was ſaid: but our Adverſarys are quite miſtaken, when they think the LORD wonders why *Nicodemus* did not underſtand the Regeneration he ſpake of; for CHRIST endeavours to convince him, that this was indeed above his Conception: and it is after this that *Nicodemus* ſays, *How can theſe things be?* and that the LORD anſwers, *Art thou a Maſter of* Iſrael, *and knoweſt not theſe things?* To *know* here does not mean to *comprehend*, or *underſtand the Nature* of the thing; but *to be convinc'd*, and *to believe*, as the ſame thing is expreſs'd Ver. 12. *I have told ye earthly things, and ye believe not.* So that our LORD wonders that *Nicodemus*, being a Teacher in *Iſrael*, ſhou'd not know and believe, notwithſtanding the Prophets had ſo plainly taught it, that there was an internal Renovation of the Mind, which all Perſons, as well the *Jews* themſelves as the *Heathens*, ſtood in need

of, and were to receive eſpecially under the Diſpenſation of the MESSIAS.

Very remarkable here are the Words of the incomparable *Grotius*: * CHRIST *diſcovers a new thing to* Nicodemus; *that now ſomething greater than* Judaiſm *was requir'd of all that ſhou'd be ſav'd.* And doubtleſs, our LORD taught him here the ſame Doctrine which St. *Paul* taught afterwards, *Gal.* vi. 15. that *in* CHRIST JESUS *neither Circumciſion availeth any thing*, &c. *but a new Creature*: for *Grotius* juſtly reckons theſe Paſſages are parallel. And this clearly ſeems to have been the common Stumbling-block which *Nicodemus* cou'd not ſurmount, *viz.* That the Law ſhou'd be counted ſo imperfect and inſufficient. What has been ſaid, I hope, proves our SAVIOUR, *John* iii. 5. means only being born of the SPIRIT, by or in the uſe of Baptiſm with Water, as the external Symbol and Seal of ſuch Regeneration.

The other Paſſage, *Tit.* iii. 5. has no manner of Difficulty in it: nor can I gueſs what cou'd incline any Man to cite it as an Inſtance, that Regeneration means Baptiſm, when it evidently means the contrary. By the *Waſhing of Regeneration*, I allow, is meant Baptiſm; that is, by the whole Phraſe: but to ſay by *Regeneration* is meant Baptiſm too, is abſurd and groundleſs enough. On another occaſion, † our Author cites this very place, and argues that λουτρὸν, *the Waſhing*, ſignifys *Baptiſm*; and makes λουτρὸν and βαπτισμὸς ſynonymous Terms: for, λελουμένοι, he ſays, means *baptiz'd*; and thence he infers, becauſe λουτρὸν ſignifys any kind of

* *In Johan.* iii. 3. Rem novam *Nicodemo* Legis Doctori CHRISTUS indicat, poſthac ad Salutem pariendum majus aliquid Judaiſmo requiri.

† Part II. pag. 221.

Waſhing,

Washing, therefore Baptism may be administer'd by any kind of Washing. But here he'll have the Word *Regeneration* mean Baptism, because this is most for his purpose now: so that take our Author altogether, and both Words mean Baptism; and then the Place may be render'd, *the Baptism of Baptism*, instead of the *Washing of Regeneration*.

Which of the two Words wou'd any Man think more particularly and properly here signify'd Baptism? That which does express some Washing, or that which has no such Sense? Every one wou'd pitch on λουτρὸν, *the Washing*, rather than *Regeneration*; for λουτρὸν is made the *Genus*, to signify Washing or Baptism in general, and *Regeneration* is added as the *Difference* to distinguish it from all other Washings, and limit the Assertion to signify, that GOD saves us by the *Christian* Baptism only, or that Washing which is *the Washing of Regeneration, and of the renewing of the HOLY GHOST.*

But we may see our Author has offer'd a great Violence to the Words, if we observe the use of the Phrase here occurring; for thus we meet with the *Baptism of Repentance* several times in the Scripture, to signify that Baptism which follows upon, is accompany'd with, and is a Sign of Repentance, as *Mark* i. 4. *Acts* xiii. 24. and xix. 4. And thus St. *Justin*, probably alluding to this Place in *Titus*, uses † διὰ τοῦ λουτροῦ μετανοίας καὶ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ ΘΕΟΥ to signify the Washing or *Baptism of Repentance, and the Knowledg of GOD*; and therefore διὰ τοῦ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ Ἀνακαινώσεως ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ ΑΓΙΟΥ, exactly the same Form of Speech, means, by the Washing or *Baptism of Regeneration, and of the renewing of the HOLY*

† Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 231. B. C.

GHOST. And as no body can be ſo wild as to imagine, that becauſe St. *Juſtin* ſays, *the Waſhing of Repentance*, therefore Repentance ſignifys Baptiſm; ſo in like manner, it is as abſurd to ſay, that when St. *Paul* ſpeaks of the *Waſhing of Regeneration*, Regeneration means Baptiſm; for the Caſe is as exactly parallel as can be wiſh'd.

I wou'd add one Remark more, *viz.* That St. *Paul* calls this *the Waſhing* (not only *of Regeneration*, but alſo) *of the renewing of the* HOLY GHOST. Every one who underſtands the *Greek* Tongue, muſt needs confeſs this is the right Conſtruction of the Place: and 'tis thus the *Ethiopick* Tranſlator has render'd it; and the *Arabick* too, notwithſtanding the Author of the *Latin* Tranſlation of the *Arabick* publiſh'd in Dr. *Walton*'s *Polyglot*, gives it a different but a wrong Turn, which the *Arabick* will not admit: for the *inſeparable* Prepoſition here, as in the *Ethiopick*, tranſlated *by*, is join'd only to *Waſhing*; and all the reſt is, as the Grammarians ſtile it, *in Statu conſtructo*, and therefore ought to be render'd, as he that added the *Latin* Tranſlation to the *Ethiopick* has likewiſe done, *by the Waſhing of Regeneration, and of the Renovation of the* HOLY GHOST. And then if Waſhing refers to the *Renovation of the* HOLY GHOST, as well as to *Regeneration*, it muſt follow, that the Renewing of the HOLY GHOST means Baptiſm as much as Regeneration does; that is, not at all: for as the Inference will be allow'd to be manifeſtly abſurd in one Caſe, ſo it is in the other. And therefore I now draw this general Concluſion, in oppoſition to our Author, that the Scriptures never call Baptiſm Regeneration.

As to his other Pretence, † *that* Regeneration

† Part I. pag. 18.

in

in the uſual Phraſe of that Time, (viz. in which St. *Irenæus* liv'd) *ſignifys* Baptiſm; and that the Antients * *never uſe the Word [regenerate] or [born again] but that they mean or denote by it Baptiſm:* 'Tis, I think, one of the moſt groundleſs Aſſertions I ever met with; for on the contrary, nothing is more common than to take this Word in a quite different Senſe, and I don't believe it is ever ſo much as once us'd in the antienteſt Times for Baptiſm, at leaſt not till their Zeal for Infant-Baptiſm betray'd 'em into that Abſurdity, which was not near the time of St. *Irenæus.*

I have ſhewn you how St. *Juſtin* uſes the Word Regeneration, and that he cannot be underſtood to mean Baptiſm by it: and 'tis very eaſy to prove as much of the other Fathers. *Clemens Alexandrinus* relates from *Alexander Polyhiſtor*, that the *Indian Brachmans* eat no living Creatures, nor drink any Wine; that ſome of 'em eat every day as we do, and others only every third day: and he adds, † *that they don't fear Death, nor eſteem Life, becauſe they reckon Death is but another Birth* (παλιγγενεσίαν). *Origen* uſes it to mean the Reſurrection, when ſpeaking of the Apoſtles he ſays, ‖ *in the Regeneration* (παλιγγενεσίᾳ) *they ſhall ſit upon twelve Thrones.* And again, on the ſame Occaſion, he ſays, (*a*) *thoſe who follow'd our* SAVIOUR *ſhall ſit upon twelve Thrones, judging the twelve Tribes of* Iſrael:

---

* Introd. p. 22.

† Stromat. lib. 3. p. 451. B. Καταφρονῶσι δὲ θανάτου, καὶ παρ' ὀλίγον ἡγοῦνται τὸ ζῆν· πείθονται γὰρ εἶναι παλιγγενεσίαν.

‖ In Matth. pag. 354. E. Οἱ καθεδοῦνται οἱ ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ ἐπὶ ιϐ' θρόνους.

(*a*) Comment. in Matth. pag. 391. C. Οἱ πίνειν οὐκολουθήσαντες τῷ ΣΩΤΗΡΙ καθεδοῦνται ἐπὶ ιϐ' θρόνους, κρίνοντες

Iſrael: *and this Power they ſhall receive in the Reſurrection of the Dead. For this is the Regeneration, it being a kind of new Generation,* &c. And this mode of Speech is borrow'd from the Scriptures themſelves, *Matth.* xix. 28. and was us'd alſo by the *Jews*, as * *Grotius* has ſhewn from *Joſephus* and *Philo*.

But to come nearer the Caſe in hand: *Tertullian* undoubtedly ſpeaks of ſomething internal, when he ſays, alluding to the *Decalogue*, that † *we are born in the ſame number of Months, as we are regenerated by Precepts. Clemens Alexandrinus* relating how St. *John* reſtor'd to the Church that young Man, who, after he had been educated in the Chriſtian Religion, and baptiz'd, became a Captain of a Band of Robbers, and commending his great Repentance, ſays, he gave ‖ *a great Example of true Repentance, and an extraordinary Inſtance of Regeneration*; that is, of Converſion; for nothing can be here underſtood by Regeneration, but an internal Change of Mind. In another Paſſage, the ſame St. *Clement* ſays, ‖‖ *the* FATHER *of all things receives thoſe that fly to Him; and having regenerated 'em* (ἀναγεννήσας) *in the Spirit, to the Adoption of Sons, He knows 'em to be*

νοντες τὰς ιϛ' Φυλὰς τῶ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ταυτὴν λήψονται τὴν Ἐξουσίαν ἐν τῇ Ἀναστάσει τῶν Νεκρῶν· αὕτη γὰρ ἔστιν ἡ Παλιγγενεσία καινή τις Γένεσις οὖσα.

* Not. in Matth. 19. 28.

† *De Anima, pag.* 292. C. Ut tanto Temporis Numero naſcamur, quanto Diſciplinæ Numero renaſcimur.

‖ Apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. 3. cap. 23. Διδὰς μέγα Παράδειγμα Μετανοίας ἀληθινῆς, καὶ μέγα Γνώρισμα Παλιγγενεσίας, &c.

‖‖ Pædagog. lib. 1. pag. 90. B. Οὕτω καὶ τῶν ὅλων ὁ ΠΑΤΗΡ τοὺς εἰς Αὐτὸν καταφεύγοντας προσίεται· καὶ ἀναγεννήσας Πνεύματι εἰς Υἱοθεσίαν, ἡτίμως εἶδεν· καὶ φιλεῖ τότε μόνως, καὶ βοηθεῖ, καὶ ὑπερμαχεῖ· καὶ διὰ τοῦτον ὀνομάζεται Παιδίον.

of a good Disposition; and them only He loves, and helps and defends; and for this cause He calls 'em Children. Here ἀναγεννήσας πνεύματι, I hope, can't be thought to mean baptiz'd, especially since it's said, that those who are so regenerated are ἵππιοι. Those Words also of this Father are very remarkable to this purpose, where he says, † *To instruct and enlighten the Understanding, is call'd also by the Heathen Philosophers* (ἀναγεννῆσαι) *to regenerate.*

The Particle *also* in this Period plainly imports, that the same way of speaking was in use among the Christians too; but the following Words make it more evident, where he cites St. *Paul* as meaning the same thing, when he says, 1 *Cor.* iv. 15. *for in* CHRIST JESUS *I have begotten you thro the Gospel.* To which he might also have added, Gal. iv. 19. *My little Children, of whom I travail in Birth again, until* CHRIST *be form'd in you:* which plainly shews the Christian Birth consists in CHRIST's being form'd in 'em. And St. *Clement* is so far from leaving any room to imagine Baptism was call'd Regeneration, that he expressly says it is the (*a*) *Sign of Regeneration:* and sure it can't be the Sign, and the Thing signify'd too. And afterwards he calls Regeneration (*b*) *a new spiritual Generation.* The whole Passage is too long to be transcrib'd; but I'll give you another which is much shorter, and very express: (*c*) *An Adulteress lives indeed to Sin, but she is dead to the Com-*

† Stromat. lib. 5. pag. 552. C. Ἐπεὶ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς βαρβάροις φιλοσόφοις, τὸ καλῆσαί τε καὶ φωτίσαι ἀναγεννῆσαι λέγεσθαι.

(*a*) Eclog. p. 801. b. D.

(*b*) Ibid. pag. 802. a. B.

(*c*) Stromat. lib. 2. pag. 425. A. Ἡ μὲν γάρ τι πορνεύσασα, ζῇ μὲν τῇ Ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἀπέθανεν δὲ ταῖς Ἐντολαῖς ἡ δὲ μεταγνοήσασα,

Commands; but ſhe that repents, being as it were regenerated (ἀναγεννηθεῖσα) *by a change of Manners, has the Regeneration* (παλιγγενεσίαν) *of Life: She is dead to the former Adulterys, and is enter'd again into Life, being regenerated* (γεννηθεῖσης) *by Repentance.* Nay, it may be yet farther obſerv'd, that inſtead of calling Baptiſm Generation or Regeneration, he directly on the contrary calls it † *Death, and the End of the old Life.*

In the ſame manner likewiſe *Origen* talks of Regeneration; in one Paſſage particularly he is very plain: and becauſe his Words, I think, unravel the whole Difficulty, and may lead into the reaſon of other more obſcure Places, I'll tranſcribe the Paſſage at large. * *The Waſhing with Water is a Symbol of a pure Mind, cleans'd from all Filthineſs of Evil: and to one who gives himſelf up to GOD, it is in it ſelf, by the Power of the Invocation of the adorable* TRINITY, *the Beginning and Fountain of divine Gifts. This the Hiſtory of the* Acts of the Apoſtles *greatly confirms, ſince 'tis related, that the* SPIRIT *did then evidently come upon thoſe who were baptiz'd, the Water preparing the way for him, in ſuch as came to it as they ought; inſomuch that* Simon *the Magician amaz'd at the Sight, wou'd have obtain'd of* Peter *the ſame Grace, and deſir'd to purchaſe the moſt righteous thing with the Mammon of Unrighteouſneſs. And it is farther to be obſerv'd, that the Baptiſm of* John *was inferiour to the Baptiſm of* JESUS, *given by his Diſciples: thoſe therefore who in the* Acts *were baptiz'd with the Baptiſm of*

πασα, οἱονει ἀναχυνηθεῖσα χ͞τ͞ν τὴν Ἐπιφοφὴν τ͞ῦ Βίυ, Παλιγχυεσίαν ἔχει Ζωῆς· τεθνηκυίας μεν τῆς Πόρνης τῆς παλαίας, εἰς Βίον δὲ παρελθέσης ἄυθις τῆς χ͞τ͞ν τὴν Μεδάνοιαν χυνηθείσης.

† Eclog. pag. 800. a. C. Θάνα͞ Θ χ᾽ Τέλ Θ λέγεται τ͞ῦ παλαι͞ῦ Βίυ τὸ Βάπ͞τισμα.

* In Johan. pag. 124, 125.

John,

John, *and had not heard whether there were any* HOLY GHOST, *were baptiz'd again by the Apostle. For the Baptism of Regeneration was not given by* John, *but by* JESUS, *by the Hands of his Disciples: and it is call'd the Laver of Regeneration, the Performance of it being accompany'd with the Renewing of the* SPIRIT; *which being from* GOD, *is now also prefer'd above the Water, but is not always ingenerated together with the Water.*

St. *Clemens Romanus* can mean nothing but internal Regeneration and Conversion, when he says, † *Noah being found faithful, preach'd Regeneration* (Παλιγγενεσίαν) *to the World.* And it's strange what cou'd be in *Junius*'s Mind to urge, that by Regeneration was to be understood in this Place the Resurrection: for *Noah* was indeed a Preacher of Repentance, but we don't find his main Business was to preach the Resurrection; nor is St. *Clement* here speaking of the Resurrection. To these I'll only add a Passage of St. *Barnabas*, which is very remarkable: * *Since therefore he has renew'd us by the remission of our Sins, he has given us another Form, that we shou'd have our Souls like the Soul of a Child; even as He Himself has form'd us.* Most directly shewing, that the Christian new Formation or Regeneration is by the SPIRIT.

And now cou'd any body, Sir, that had read these Passages, fairly pretend the Antients by *Regeneration* always mean Baptism? If Mr. *Wall* had not read these Books, he ought not so readily to have made the Assertion: and if he has read

† Epist. 1. ad. Corinth. cap. 9. Νῶε πιστὸς εὑρεθεὶς, διὰ τῆς Λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ Παλιγγενεσίαν Κόσμῳ ἐκήρυξε, &c.

* Epist. cap. 6. pag. 18. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀνακαινίσας ἡμᾶς ἐν τῇ Ἀφέσει τῶν Ἁμαρτιῶν, ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς ἄλλον Τύπον, ὡς Παιδίον ἔχειν τὴν ψυχὴν, ὡς ἂν ᾖ ἀναπλαττομένων Αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς.

them

them, what Excuſe can be fram'd for him? For 'tis apparent from theſe Inſtances, to which many more might have been added, that the moſt antient Fathers, by Regeneration, mean ſomething ſpiritual and internal, and very different from Baptiſm. And the ſame might be very eaſily prov'd too, from his admir'd St. *Auſtin* himſelf; but it is needleſs. Inſtead of it we will examine the other Poſition he lays down, to prove that *regenerated* in the Words he cites from St. *Irenæus*, means baptiz'd: and this will quickly be found to be as groundleſs as the other.

He ſays, † Irenæus *has us'd* this Word *ſo in all other places of his Book, that* he has *ever obſerv'd.* But if our Author has not obſerv'd the ſeveral Paſſages where 'tis us'd otherwiſe, I can't help it: however, the Argument depends not ſo much upon his Obſervation, as upon the Truth of the Thing it ſelf. But if he had pleas'd, one wou'd think he might have obſerv'd, that St. *Irenæus* no where uſes the Word ſo, (at leaſt, I am moſt inclin'd to think ſo) becauſe the Inſtance he cites is ſo far from proving what he produces it for, that it well enough proves the direct contrary: and therefore I am ſurpriz'd that the learned Dr. *Grabe* ſhou'd refer to it alſo with the ſame Deſign as our Author. For to go no farther than the Words Mr. *Wall* has tranſcrib'd, there is not the leaſt reaſon to ſay St. *Irenæus* means Baptiſm by Regeneration. *When He gave His Diſciples the Commiſſion of* regenerating *unto G O D, He ſaid unto them,* Go and teach, *&c.* But why muſt we conclude from theſe Words, that St. *Irenæus* means by regenerating, baptizing? Is it not as good Senſe, and very agreeable with our SAVIOUR's Deſign

---

† Part I. pag. 19.

in

in the Commiſſion, by regenerating to underſtand *teaching*, *inſtructing*, *enlightning the Mind*, and *converting* the Nations to GOD? This doubtleſs was their chief Buſineſs, tho they were likewiſe to baptize all they had ſo converted. And therefore it is very arbitrary to reſtrain the Word *regenerate* from ſignifying what was the main Deſign of the Commiſſion, and to limit it, even contrary to its proper Signification and general Uſe, only to the leſs principal.

But the next Words of *Irenæus* make it appear more clearly, that he meant an internal Regeneration by the Spirit. * *For* GOD *promis'd to pour him out upon his Servants and Handmaids in the latter Days, that they might propheſy: wherefore he deſcended upon the* SON *of* GOD, *when he became the Son of Man, accuſtoming himſelf in him to dwell with Mankind, and to reſt in Men, and to dwell in the Creature of* GOD, *working in them the Will of the* FATHER, *and of old making them new in* CHRIST. It's plain from hence that the Regeneration or Renewing St. *Irenæus* ſpeaks of, is to be wrought by the SPIRIT's indwelling. And a little after, ſpeaking of our becoming one in CHRIST, he ſays, † *Our Bodys receive that Unity which is to Immortality, by the Laver; but our Souls by the SPIRIT:* ſhewing again, that he argues here

* Lib. 3. cap. 19. pag. 243. b. Hunc enim promiſit per Prophetas effundere in noviſſimis temporibus ſuper Servos & Ancillas ut prophetent: unde & in FILIUM DEI, Filium Hominis factum, deſcendit, cum ipſo aſſueſcens habitare in Genere humano, & requieſcere in Hominibus, & habitare in Plaſmate DEI, Voluntatem PATRIS operans in ipſis, & renovans eos à Vetuſtate in Novitatem CHRISTI.

† Ibid. pag. 244. a. Corpora enim noſtra per Lavacrum illam, quæ eſt ad Incorruptionem, Unitatem acceperunt: Animæ autem per SPIRITUM.

chiefly

chiefly upon that which is ſpiritual, and ſufficiently implying, the Regeneration he had before ſpoken of was ſuch. The other Paſſage which Dr. *Grabe* refers || to, is, I think, likewiſe directly to the contrary Senſe; the Words are theſe: * *Becauſe this Kind are ſubjected to Satan, to the denying of the Baptiſm of Regeneration to* GOD, *and the Deſtruction of the whole Faith*, &c. Now even here he does not ſay *that Baptiſm which is Regeneration*, no more than the Phraſe *the Baptiſm of Repentance*, means *the Baptiſm which is Repentance:* and if it will not follow from this Phraſe that Repentance means Baptiſm, then it will not follow in the other that Regeneration means Baptiſm. But it will be yet more clear that Regeneration does not mean Baptiſm, by what *Irenæus* adds: † *But they ſay it (viz.* what they call'd Redemption) *is neceſſary*, &c. *that they may be regenerated unto that Power which is above all.* Now this being ſaid of thoſe who deny Baptiſm, the Word *regenerated* cannot mean *baptiz'd:* and a little after again 'tis ſaid, ‖‖ *Baptiſm indeed was of* JESUS *for the Remiſſion of Sins, but the Redemption is of* CHRIST *that came upon him to Perfection*; which ſufficiently diſtinguiſhes Baptiſm from Redemption, which *is neceſſary that they may be regenerated*, for it is oppos'd to it.

St. *Irenæus* does not very often uſe the Word *regenerate*; but where he does, I am pretty well

|| In Irenæum, Lib. 2. cap. 39. pag. 161. not. 1.

* Lib. 1. cap. 18. pag. 88. Καὶ ὅτι μὴ εἰς Ἐξάρνησιν τοῦ Βαπτίσματος τοῦ εἰς Θεὸν Ἀναγεννήσεως, καὶ πάσης τῆς Πίστεως Ἀποθεσιν ὑποβέβλεσθαι τὸ Εἶδος τοῦτο τοῦ Σατανᾶ.

† Ibid. Λέγουσι δὲ αὐτὴν ἀναγκαίαν εἶναι — ἵνα εἰς τὸν ὑπὲρ πάντα Δύναμιν ὦσιν ἀναγεγεννημένοι.

‖‖ Ibid. pag. 89. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ Βάπτισμα τοῦ φανερωθέντος ΙΗΣΟΥ, Ἀφέσεως Ἁμαρτιῶν, τὸν δὲ Ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ ἐν Αὐτῷ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ κατελθόντος εἰς Τελείωσιν.

assur'd,

assur'd it never means *baptize:* and tho it is not impossible but I may have pass'd by some Passage, or mistaken the Sense somewhere, yet I have taken so much care, that I think I may very well venture to assert, there is not one Place in all St. *Irenæus*'s Books, in which it plainly means Baptism, or may not at least full as well mean something else; and that there are Instances in which it cannot mean Baptism, is beyond dispute. In one Place he says, * *How shall they leave the Generation of Death, if they do not receive the Regeneration which is by Faith, believing in that new Generation given by GOD in that wonderful unexpected manner in sign of Salvation, which was of the Virgin by Faith?* The Regeneration *by Faith* here, is elsewhere † said to be *by the Laver:* now as Regeneration is different from the Faith *by which* it is in one place; so it is also different from the Laver or Baptism *by which* it is in the other. But I need add no more, to shew you how much our Author is out in saying St. *Irenæus* has us'd *regenerate* for *baptize* in all other Places of his Book; since he uses it so in no part of his Writings, and sometimes so as plainly not to mean Baptism: and therefore it is not true that it always means Baptism in this Book, unless Mr. *Wall* means in the second Book particularly, out of which the Citation is taken, and then indeed his Assertion can't be deny'd; for the Word is us'd in no other place of that Book at all.

---

* Lib. 4. cap. 59. pag. 358. a. Quomodo autem relinquet Mortis Generationem, si non in novam Generationem mirè & inopinatè à DEO, in signum autem salutis, datam, quæ est ex Virgine per Fidem, credens eam recipiat quæ est per Fidem Regenerationem?

† Lib. 5. cap. 15. pag. 423. b. Eam quæ est per Lavacrum Regenerationem, &c.

Since then the Scriptures, the Primitive Fathers, and among the reſt St. *Irenæus* himſelf, by Regeneration never mean Baptiſm, 'tis highly unreaſonable to pretend it means ſo in this ſingle place; or if there ſhou'd be ſome Inſtances where it does ſometimes ſignify Baptiſm, there are many more, or at leaſt ſome, where it plainly ſignifys quite another thing: and therefore, why muſt it needs mean Baptiſm in this Paſſage? If it does not mean Baptiſm always, then perhaps it may not in this Place neither.

One Reaſon Mr. *Wall* gives for ſaying it muſt mean Baptiſm in this Place, is, that here is expreſs mention of Infants who † *are not capable of Regeneration in any other Senſe of the Word, than as it ſignifys Baptiſm.* But this is only begging the Queſtion. Beſides, Mr. *Wall* contradicts it himſelf, when he goes about to ſhew that Infants may be regenerated of the SPIRIT, according to our LORD's Rule, as well as of Water; and tells us, ‖ *that GOD by his SPIRIT does, at the time of Baptiſm, ſeal and apply to the Infant that is there dedicated to him, the Promiſes of the Covenant of which he is capable,* viz. *Adoption, Pardon of Sin, Tranſlation from the State of Nature to that of Grace,* &c. *on which account the Infant is ſaid to be* regenerated of [*or by*] the Spirit. There is another Regeneration then beſides Baptiſm mention'd by our LORD himſelf, of which our Author tells us Infants are capable; and why might not this be the Regeneration meant by St. *Irenæus* without Baptiſm? And how came Mr. *Wall* to be ſo overſeen as to ſay there is no other Regeneration of which they are capable?

† Part I. pag. 20.
‖ Part I. pag. 148. & Part II. pag. 126.

2. But

2. But this Paſſage of St. *Irenæus*, tho it had been genuine and well tranſlated, wou'd have been liable to a ſecond Exception, *viz.* that the word *Infantes* does not neceſſarily ſignify here ſuch new-born or young Children, as are not capable of Reaſon; but may very well mean only ſuch as can know and believe, and make a Profeſſion of their Faith. I will not go about to prove that this Word and ſeveral others of much the ſame Senſe, are often apply'd to grown and even to aged Perſons, to expreſs their being but young or weak in Chriſtianity, which Mr. *Wall* and every body allows; becauſe the Chapter, as it now ſtands, ſpeaks of their Natural not their Chriſtian Age: but however it will not follow that *Infantes* means only ſuch Children as are wholly incapable of knowing and believing the neceſſary Principles of the Chriſtian Religion, which is the Suppoſition of our Adverſarys; for the term *Infant* is of a larger Extent.

Indeed if it meant only a ſucking Child, or one of two or three Months or Years, or the like, our Author might have ſomething to plead; but if it means all Perſons till 21 Years of Age, as in our *Engliſh* Law, he cou'd form no Argument from it, tho it were ſaid Infants were to be baptiz'd. The whole Buſineſs between us is reduc'd therefore to this, namely to determine the Period of Infancy; and what muſt be meant by the Word in the Paſſage under Conſideration.

If it be urg'd that St. *Irenæus* ſays CHRIST ſanctify'd *(omnem Ætatem) every ſeveral Age*, as Mr. *Wall* renders it; and conſequently that he means the youngeſt Infants too, who muſt be comprehended in ſo large an Expreſſion: it may be noted that St. *Cyprian* uſes the ſame Phraſe, yet ſo as Infants cannot be comprehended, when he

ſays, * *The Word of* GOD, *our* LORD JESUS CHRIST, *came to all; and gathering both the learned and unlearned, he gave the Precepts of Salvation to both Sexes, and* (omni Ætati) *to every ſeveral Age.* So when the Author of the *Recognitions* ſays, † *Therefore let* (omnis Ætas) *every ſeveral Age, both Sexes, and all Conditions haſten to Repentance,* &c. undoubtedly he did not mean ſuch Infants too, as were not capable of Repentance. I will add one Inſtance more in the Words of *Dionyſius* the ‖ *great* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, who in a Letter to *Demetius* and *Didymus* ſays thus, †† *It is needleſs to mention the Names of the many Martyrs among us who were unknown to you; but know this, that Men and Women, young Men and old Men, young Women and old Women, Soldiers and private Perſons, all Sorts, and* (πᾶσα Ἡλικία) *all Ages, ſome gaining the Victory by Scourges and Fire, and others by the Sword, have obtain'd their Crowns.* Now as it's inconteſtable that this Phraſe cannot include the youngeſt Infants in theſe Inſtances, ſo it need not be extended to ſuch in the Words of St. *Irenæus.*

Nor does the Enumeration of the ſeveral Ages make it neceſſary to underſtand ſuch Infants by the

---

* De Orat. Domin. pag. 107. Nam cum DEI Sermo DOMINUS noſter JESUS CHRISTUS omnibus venerit, & colligens doctos, pariter & indoctos, omni Sexui atque Ætati Præcepta Salutis ediderit, &c.

† Lib. 10. cap. 45. Itaque feſtinet ad Pœnitentiam omnis Ætas, omnis Sexus, omniſque Conditio, &c.

‖ Euſeb. Præfat. in Lib. 7. Hiſt. Eccleſ.

†† Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. 7. cap. 11. Τὰς δὲ ἡμετέρας πολλάς τε οὔσας καὶ ἀνηρίθμους ὑμῖν, πλείοσιν ὀνόμασι καταλέξαι πλὴν ἴσθι ὅτι Ἄνδρες καὶ Γυναῖκες καὶ Νέοι καὶ Γέροντες, καὶ Κόραι καὶ Πρεσβύτιδες, καὶ Στρατιῶται καὶ Ἰδιῶται, καὶ πᾶν Γένος καὶ πᾶσα Ἡλικία, ἐν μὲν, διὰ Μαστίγων καὶ Πυρὸς· οἱ δὲ, διὰ Σιδήρου τὸν Ἀγῶνα νικήσαντες, τὰς Στεφάνους ἀπειλήφασι.

Word:

Word: we must consider how far each of those Ages extends, at what Period they begin, and at what they conclude. Now that Infancy was not confin'd to the narrow Limits in which we commonly use the Word, is I think past doubt. *Origen* has a remarkable Passage to this effect: tho he does not make use of this particular Word, yet the Words he does use are equally expressive of the tendereſt Age. ‖ *Those*, says he, *who from their Childhood and first Age, are call'd to do the Works of the Kingdom of* GOD, *&c.* And St. *Irenæus* himself in his Epistle to *Florinus* uses πρώτη Ἡλικία, tho it be properly enough said even of new-born Infants, in so large a Sense as to reach that Age, in which he cou'd hear and understand the Teachings of St. *Polycarp*, so as to remember 'em perfectly well in his old Age: from whence it appears that the *first* of those Ages, into which they divided Man's Life, was not shut up in very narrow Bounds.

Feuardentius has noted from *Philo*, that *Hippocrates* limits Infancy to seven Years; but *Danet*, * from the *Greek* and *Latin* Writers, extends it to 14: and this seems to be nearest St. *Irenæus*'s Mind, as may be collected from his own Words. *Juvenes* extends to between 30 and 40: *Seniores* between 40 and 50, in the latter part of this very Chapter, from whence the Pædobaptists argue. And as he has thus assign'd 10 Years to each of the two last Stages, nothing can be more probable than that the three first were of the same Length: upon this Computation therefore Infancy will reach to ten Years of Age; *Parvuli* will include all from thence to twenty, and

‖ In Matth. pag. 406. C. Τὰς μὲν ἐκ Παίδων, καὶ πρώτης Ἡλικίας καλουμένας ὅτι τὸ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ τῆς Βασιλείας τοῦ ΘΕΟΥ Ἔρχα, &c.

† Diction. Antiq. Rom. & Græc. pag. 51.

Pueri from twenty to thirty. This is the more confirm'd, becauſe it agrees with St. *Irenæus*'s ſaying, he ſaw *Florinus* when he was *Puer*, παῖς; for, as the Time is laboriouſly calculated by the accurate Mr. *Dodwell*, he was then about 25, which falls in very well with that Computation which makes the Limits of the Age St. *Irenæus* calls *Pueros*, to be from 20 to 30. Mr. *Dodwell*, who is of the ſame Opinion in this Caſe, very learnedly illuſtrates the Matter, and after him I muſt not attempt it; and therefore I refer you to his learned Diſſertations *.

If then *Infantes*, in the Language of St. *Irenæus*, means not only ſuch as we now commonly call Infants, of a few Months, but alſo any under ten Years of Age; what Advantage can the Pædobaptiſts gain by citing this Paſſage? They ſhou'd prove the youngeſt Infants, who have not the leaſt Uſe of Reaſon, are to be baptiz'd: whereas this Place of St. *Irenæus* at moſt proves only that Perſons may be baptiz'd under 10 Years of Age. Now we only inſiſt that Perſons cannot be baptiz'd till they actually know, or at leaſt profeſs to know and believe the firſt Principles of the Chriſtian Religion: they who make ſuch a Profeſſion, tho ever ſo young, ought to be baptiz'd. And when the Pædobaptiſts pretend to oppoſe us, by citing Paſſages in which the Words have a larger Acceptation than they commonly have at preſent, it is all trifling, and can make nothing to the Purpoſe, unleſs the Words were taken in the ſame limited Senſe in the Paſſage cited, as they are in the Queſtion.

As ſoon as Perſons are capable of being taught what the Apoſtles requir'd of thoſe they baptiz'd,

---

* In Irenæum, Diſſertat. 3. §. 6, &c.

ſo

ſo ſoon they may be made fit for, and receiv'd to Baptiſm; for there is no other ſet time when they muſt be receiv'd but this, *viz.* when they believe. And that Children under ten are capable of this, none can doubt who underſtand any thing of the Power of Education. Common Experience ſhews us how far that Age can go in many things, eſpecially if improv'd by a good Education. If you know any of Mr. *Lock*'s Acquaintance, they will tell you many ſtrange Truths of the Effects of his Method on ſeveral who have had the Happineſs to be brought up in it. And pray, why ſhou'd not that Age be thought as capable of the plain eaſy Principles of Chriſtianity as of any thing elſe? St. *Auſtin* † himſelf allows, as our Author ‖ notes, that at ſeven Years Children might be able to make the neceſſary Reſponſes. And I have known ſome admitted at about 14, and heard of ſome much younger; and 'tis only for want of due Care, that there are not many more ſuch Inſtances: ſo that at moſt all that can be ſaid from this Paſſage amounts but to this, That ſome Infants, that is, ſome under 10 Years of Age, may be admitted to Baptiſm; which makes nothing againſt our Opinion, for ſuch alſo may believe. But if it be conſider'd, 1. How doubtful it is whether the Paſſage be genuine; 2. Whether it be well tranſlated; 3. Whether it ſpeaks of baptizing; and laſtly, That 'tis plain it does not neceſſarily ſpeak of Infants ſo young: it muſt be allow'd that this famous Citation, after all the Noiſe it has made, can't be ſufficient for any reaſonable Man to lay a ſtreſs upon it. And yet this is by far the moſt conſiderable our Adverſarys can pro-

† Lib. 1. de Anima, cap. 10.
‖ Part I. pag. 188, & 288.

duce ſo early. I have now made it appear, that for two hundred Years after CHRIST, nothing can be argu'd with any Force for Pædobaptiſm; for St. *Irenæus* liv'd to about *Anno* 190. And the next Author Mr. *Wall* argues from is *Tertullian*, who did not write till about the Beginning of the third Century. What he ſays ſhall be refer'd to the following Letter. I am,

SIR,

Yours, *&c.*

LETTER

LETTER XIII.

An Argument against Infant-Baptism, drawn from Polycrates's *Letter to* Victor. Tertullian *no friend to Infant-Baptism; which makes Mr.* Wall *begin his Citations from him with decrying his Authority. His general Expressions no Argument for Pædobaptism.* Tertullian's steady Meaning *easy to be come at, without Mr.* Wall's *extravagant Guesses.* Tertullian's *mentioning Infant-Baptism, no Argument it was practis'd in his time; but only that some were endeavouring to bring in the Practice.* Tertullian *does not simply advise (as Mr.* Wall *pretends) to defer the baptizing of Children, but argues against it as a thing that ought not to be done. The Reading of the Passage on which Mr.* Wall *grounds his Supposition, altogether impertinent and absurd.* Tertullian's *Doctrine concerning Baptism inconsistent with Pædobaptism. His Exposition of* 1 Cor. vii. 14. *not in favour of Pædobaptism. Not one Author cited of the first three Centurys, who understands that Text of Baptism. Mr.* Wall's *Endeavours to prove that* ἅγιος, &c. *means* wash'd, *&c. ineffectual. The Sense given by the Bishop of* Sarum, *and by Dr.* Whitby, *cannot be the true one. The best Interpretation which can be made upon our Author's own Principles, is that he so much despises,* viz. *that by Holiness is meant Legitimacy. This prov'd to be the true Sense.* Holy, *never signifys* baptize. *When Mr.* Wall *comes to* Origen, *he cites some Passages which are plain to his Purpose. But they are only taken from* Latin

Latin *Tranſlations. The Paſſage ſome cite from the* Greek *Remains of this Father (as Mr.* Wall *himſelf confeſſes) proves nothing. The* Latin *Tranſlations from whence the main Citations are taken, are very corrupt and licentious. Several Learned Men confeſs it. As* Grotius. Huetius. Daille. Du Pin. Tarinus. *Which is alſo abundantly prov'd, by comparing the Tranſlation with the* Greek *Fragments, as now extant. St.* Hierom *was not more faithful in his Tranſlations than* Ruffinus. *'Tis very probable they took this liberty in all other things, as well as in thoſe particularly for which* Origen *was queſtion'd.* Ruffinus, *notwithſtanding what Mr.* Wall *ſays to the contrary, took as much liberty with the Epiſtle to the* Romans *as he did with other Books. He expreſly ſays he had added many things. Beſides, that Commentary was very much interpolated before* Ruffinus *took it in hand. As to the Paſſage taken out of the Homilys on* Joſhua, *it's at beſt doubtful whether he ſpeaks of Infants in Age. In one part of theſe Homilys he has inſerted, tho it be not in the Original, this Paſſage particularly, which is the Ground of the Pædobaptiſts Argument. In St.* Cyprian's *time Infant-Baptiſm was practis'd in* Africa; *and probably firſt took riſe there, together with Infant-Communion. The* Africans, *generally Men of weak Underſtanding. The* Greek *Church, probably, had not yet admitted the Error. The Inference from the whole. A Recapitulation. A Reaſon why ſo much only of Mr.* Wall's *Hiſtory as relates to the firſt Centurys, is examin'd. How Infant-Baptiſm was at firſt brought in uſe. Errors ſprung up in the Church very early. This of Infant-Baptiſm not brought in all at once, but by degrees: and was occaſion'd in ſome meaſure by their Zeal, which was not always according to Knowledg, as ſeveral other things were. A Parallel betwixt this Practice and the Popiſh*

pish Notion of Transubstantiation. When John iii. 5. *was understood to relate to Infants, as well as others, no wonder Infants were baptiz'd. Upon just such another Mistake of our* SAVIOUR's *Words in* John vi. 53. *the earliest Pædobaptists admitted Children to the* LORD's *Supper. Conclusion.*

SIR,

BEFORE I examine what our Author urges from *Tertullian*, I will give you an Argument against Infant-Baptism which naturally falls in about this time: it is, for ought I know, wholly new, and perhaps may not be unacceptable; if it be, you may easily pass it over, for it is but short.

I take it from the Letter *Polycrates* writ to *Victor* concerning *Easter*, wherein he says thus: * *I* Polycrates, *the meanest of you all, according to the Tradition of my Kinsmen, some of whom also I follow; for seven of my Relations were Bishops, and I am the eighth, and they always celebrated the Feast, when the People remov'd the Leven: I, therefore, Brethren, who am* 65 *Years old in the* LORD, &c. Now from these Words I gather, 1. That this Bishop was descended of Christian Parents; than which nothing can seem more probable, since he himself assures us there had been so many Bishops in the Family, and 'tis likely his Father was one. Mr. *Dodwell*, speaking of Hereditary Priest-

* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Lib. 5. cap. 25. Ἐπὶ δὲ κἀγὼ ὁ μικρότερος πάντων ὑμῶν Πολυκράτης, κατὰ παράδοσιν τῶν συγγενῶν μου, οἷς καὶ παρηκολούθησα ποτὲ αὐτός. ἑπτὰ μὲν ἦσαν συγγενεῖς μου Ἐπίσκοποι. ἐγὼ δὲ ὄγδοος· καὶ πάντοτε τὴν Ἡμέραν ἦγαγον οἱ συγγενεῖς μου, ὅταν ὁ λαὸς ἄρυε τὴν ζύμην ἐγὼ οὖν Ἀδελφοὶ ξέ Ἐπὶ ἔχων ἐν ΚΥΡΙΩ, &c.

hood,

hood, ſays, † *The Prieſthood came by Inheritance to* Scopelianus, *an Orator in* Aſia, *as* Philoſtratus *teſtifys; and in like manner perhaps* Polycrates *was eighth Biſhop of the ſame Family in* Aſia.

2. *Polycrates* ſays he was 65 Years old *in the* LORD; which plainly diſtinguiſhes between his natural Age, and his Age *in the* LORD: ſeveral Inſtances of this way of ſpeaking are to be met with in the New Teſtament. All which put together, I think, ſhews that tho *Polycrates* was born of Chriſtian Parents, he was not baptiz'd in his Infancy; but, according to the Uſe of the Church of that time, when he was able to anſwer for himſelf. I think there is no need to prove any part of this; and therefore I leave the Argument with you as it is, and proceed now to *Tertullian*.

Mr. *Wall* begins with leſſening *Tertullian*'s Reputation, and accuſes him of having fallen into *great and monſtrous Errors*. Is all this Severity againſt *Tertullian*, becauſe his Books afford ſeveral Arguments againſt Pædobaptiſm? Mr. *Wall* ſays, *Tertullian has ſpoke ſo in this matter of Infant-Baptiſm, as that it is hard to reconcile the ſeveral Paſſages with one another:* which is pretty ſtrange too; for our Author cites but one Place where this Father ſpeaks of it at all, and there he ſpeaks againſt it: and I don't ſee any need to reconcile this with other Paſſages which do not ſpeak of it.

But it ſeems *Tertullian*, in ſome Places, ſpeaks of the *Neceſſity* of Baptiſm in ſuch general Terms,

† De Jure Laic. Sacerdot. pag. 220. Sacerdotium *Scopeliano* Rhetori in *Aſia* hæreditarium fuiſſe Teſtis eſt *Philoſtratus*, quo etiam Exemplo fortaſſe *Polycrates* in eâdem *Aſiâ* octavus ejuſdem Familiæ geſſit inter Chriſtianos Epiſcopatum.

as

as to reckon *those that die unbaptiz'd, as lost Men:* and from thence our Author concludes, that to be sure *Tertullian*, and the Church of that time, thought Children ought to be baptiz'd. The Answer is short and easy; for he does, in as general Terms, say, * *They who come to be baptiz'd, do, at the Place and Time of Baptism, and before, in the Church, renounce the Devil*, &c. And he frequently says full as much of the Necessity of Faith as he does of Baptism; in Imitation of the Scriptures, which say, that *now* GOD *hath commanded all Men every where to repent*, Acts xvii. 30. And that *he will have all Men to be sav'd, and to come to the Knowledg of the Truth*, 1 Tim. ii. 4. Again, *without Faith it is impossible to please* GOD, Heb. xi. 6. *Follow Peace with all Men, and Holiness without which no Man shall see the* LORD, Heb. xii. 14. *Tertullian* can't possibly express himself more universally than these Holy Writers have here done, and yet no body imagines Infants are included; and therefore such Expressions afford no more Reason to say, *Tertullian* any where countenances the Baptism of Infants, than when he says, † *This Command is given to all, Seek and ye shall find.*

After Mr. *Wall* has cited several Passages which he thinks a little inconsistent with one another, he pretends to *guess* at what might be ‖ *his steady meaning* (*if he had any*;) for that's very doubtful in our Author's Opinion. But indeed I think it is easy to see that *Tertullian* thought Baptism was

---

* De Corona, pag. 102. A. Aquam adituri, ibidem, sed & aliquanto prius in Ecclesia sub Antistitis Manu contestamur nos renunciare Diabolo.

† De Præscript. ad Hæretic. pag. 205. D. Omnibus dictum sit, Quærite & invenietis, &c

‖ Part I. pag. 28.

necessary

neceſſary to all ſuch as had heard of CHRIST, and of its Inſtitution; and that ſuch cou'd not be ſav'd if they refus'd to own his Authority: but he ſays no ſuch thing of others, who were incapable of knowing or doing the Divine Will. And therefore he excuſes the * Patriarchs expreſly from that Neceſſity, becauſe it was not poſſible they ſhou'd practiſe what was then not inſtituted, or believe JESUS was the MESSIAH, when he was not yet come: The ſame thing in effect he ſays of Infants too, where he oppoſes their being baptiz'd till they are capable of knowing and deſiring to come to CHRIST.

But our Adverſarys argue, ſince *Tertullian* mentions Infant-Baptiſm, it muſt have been known and practis'd in his time; and tho he oppoſes it, his private Opinion ſignifys nothing: for it is the Practice of the Church, and not the Opinion of one Doctor, which is to be regarded. To this we may return.

1. That *Tertullian*, as is plain from many other Places, ſpeaks ſo of Baptiſm, as is utterly inconſiſtent with Pædobaptiſm; and the Paſſage particularly here refer'd to, if it were a little doubtful, might be clear'd up by them.

2. That it at moſt only proves, there were ſome Perſons at that time, who among many other wild Notions were about to introduce this of the Neceſſity of Baptiſm to the Salvation of Infants; and not, as Mr. *Wall* pretends, that it was the Opinion of the Church, or that they practis'd Infant-Baptiſm.

Had it been the ſettled Practice and Judgment of the Church, and what they thought was ſupported by the Authority and Tradition of the

---

* De Baptiſmo, cap. 13. pag. 229.

Apoſ-

Apoſtles, *&c.* it can't be imagin'd that *Tertullian* ſhou'd venture to oppoſe it; or if he did, that he ſhou'd employ no more pains to excuſe what ſeem'd to contradict the Doctrine and Practice of the Apoſtles and the whole Church.

But, ſays Mr. *Wall*, it's plain *Tertullian* only pleaded for deferring the Baptiſm of Infants when there was no immediate danger of Death, becauſe in ſome (which he takes to be the truer) Copys, it is ſaid, *For what need is there unleſs in Caſes of Neceſſity*, &c. implying, that in Caſes of Danger they ought indeed to be baptiz'd without delay: But the Tautology of theſe Words ſeems very impertinent, as if *Tertullian* had argu'd thus, either there is ſome Neceſſity, or there is no Neceſſity; if there is no Neceſſity, then what Neceſſity is there? For the Paſſage, as Mr. *Wall* wou'd read it, will run exactly thus: *What Neceſſity is there unleſs there be a Neceſſity? Pamelius*, upon whoſe Authority our Author builds, confeſſes he has it only from *Gagnæus*, whoſe ſingle Judgment is not ſufficient. *Rigaltius* notes *, that *Copys differ*, and ſays that the old *Paris Edition* meaning that of *Gagnæus*, but without adding any other that does ſo too) fooliſhly repeats the word *Neceſſe*. And *Grotius* †, obſerving the ſame Variety, confeſſes he *can't ſee what tolerable Senſe thoſe Words can have*; and therefore he leaves 'em out as ſpurious. And till better Authoritys can be produc'd to confirm that Reading, we ſhall think the Repetition too ſilly for *Tertullian*, and therefore reject it.

It's frivolous to ſay *Tertullian* is as much againſt the Baptiſm of all unmarry'd Perſons, *&c.* as of

---

* *In the firſt Edition*, Anno 1634.

† In Matth. cap. xix. 14.

In-

Infants; as Mr. *Wall* does from Biſhop *Fell* *. He adviſes ſuch, indeed, as are in any danger of ſinning, to delay their being baptiz'd; but he plainly oppoſes the Baptiſm of Infants upon quite different Topicks, namely, becauſe they are incapable of that Sacrament, and becauſe they have no need of it, and it ought not to be adminiſtred to 'em. He makes it therefore uſeleſs and unlawful to baptize Infants; but does not intimate ſo of unmarry'd Perſons, *&c.*

How unfit Infants are for Baptiſm, he ſhews in other Places; as when he ſays, † *The Soul is ſanctify'd not by Waſhing, but by the Anſwer* of a good Conſcience; as St. *Peter* ſays, 1 *Epiſt. Chap.* iii. 21. to which Place *Tertullian* probably alludes. And again, to omit abundance more which might be cited, arguing about the Uſe and Neceſſity of Repentance, he ſays, ‖ *Baptiſm is the Seal of Faith; which Faith is begun and adorn'd by the Faith of Repentance. We are not therefore waſh'd that we may leave ſinning, but becauſe we have already done it, and are already purify'd in our Hearts.* Are theſe the Words of a Man who thought Baptiſm might be given to Infants? Are Infants already purify'd in Heart? Have they left ſinning? And are they therefore waſh'd? Have they any ſuch Faith as *Tertullian* here ſpeaks of? And yet he ſays, Baptiſm is the Seal of this ſort of Faith particularly; and therefore doubtleſs he thought

---

* In Cyprian. Epiſt. 64.

† De Reſurrection. cap. 48. pag. 355. B. Anima non Lavatione ſed Reſponſione ſancitur.

‖ De Pœnitentiâ, cap. 6. pag. 125. B. Lavacrum illud Obſignatio eſt Fidei, quæ Fides à Pœnitentiæ Fide incipitur & commendatur. Non ideo abluimur, ut delinquere deſinamus, ſed quia deſiimus: quoniam jam Corde loti ſumus.

the

the Seal cou'd not be regularly apply'd where this Faith was wanting. But our Adversarys don't much heed what *Tertullian* says, he being so much against 'em; tho if he is thought to speak any thing in their Favour, he is a good Authority enough. And therefore Mr. *Wall* was unwilling to slip the occasion of noting from *Tertullian*'s Exposition of 1 *Cor.* vii. 14. that those Words are by him understood of Baptism, and the Holiness there spoken of, is *Baptismal Holiness.* But what Advantage he propos'd to himself by this I can't guess; for he allows *Tertullian* paraphrases *Holy* by *design'd for Holiness*, and therefore only meant at most that they were design'd to be baptiz'd in time, which is opposite to the Sense the modern Pædobaptists plead for.

Besides, I don't see *Tertullian* gives any Intimation that he understood this Passage to relate to Baptism at all; on the contrary, he says, they are * *holy by the Prerogative of that Seed, and the Instruction in their Education*, but not a word of Baptism: nay he, as plainly as Words can express, refers to the Cleanness or Holiness of Birth, and understands St. *Paul* so too, when he repeats his Sense thus, *of either Parent sanctify'd the Children are* born *Holy.* I hope you don't think he meant they were born *baptiz'd*: And again he adds, *otherwise they wou'd be born unclean*; which Passages Mr. *Wall* has not rightly translated, as you may see by comparing his *English* with the *Latin.*

Tho Mr. *Wall* has taken such pains † to shew, the Antients generally understood this Passage concerning Baptism, yet he has not once attempted to

* De Anima, cap. 39. Tam ex seminis Prærogativa, quam ex Institutionis Disciplina.

† Part I. pag. 217, &c.

ſhew that any of the Fathers of the firſt 300 Years underſtood it ſo; and I don't remember that a ſingle Inſtance can be produc'd for it from their Writings, tho I might eaſily produce ſeveral to the contrary from St. *Irenæus*, St. *Clement* of *Alexandria*, &c. And as for the following Centurys, in which Infant-Baptiſm, together with a multitude of intolerable Errors, prevail'd in the Church; it is not to be wonder'd at, if ſeveral Paſſages of Scripture were ſtrangely miſapply'd, to defend 'em.

To as little purpoſe are all Mr. *Wall*'s Endeavours * to ſhew the Words ἅγιος, ἁγιάζεσθαι, ἁγνίζειν, &c. mean to *waſh*, or *baptize*. For, not to enter nicely into the Examination of the Matter, it's plain they much more commonly mean no ſuch thing; in Scripture they ſignify to *conſecrate*, Ezek. xxii. 26. to *hallow*, Matt. vi. 9. and ſometimes they mean the Sanctification of our Lives and Actions, *Lev.* xx. 7. and frequently elſewhere. For what Reaſon then will our Adverſarys ſo reſolutely fix a Senſe here, that is ſeldom if ever us'd, rather than any of the more common and eaſy Acceptations? Why may not we read the Place, *the unbelieving Huſband has been* prevail'd on *by the believing Wife* to forſake his former Vices and irregular Courſe of Life, *&c.* as well as according to the Pædobaptiſt's Paraphraſe? eſpecially ſince the Apoſtle in the next Verſe but one ſhews he had that in his Mind, *For what knoweſt thou, O Wife, whether thou ſhalt ſave thy Husband?* &c. 'Tis thus *Origen* ſeems to underſtand it by his ſaying, † *When the Husband believes firſt, he ſometimes ſaves his Wife;*

* Part I. pag. 82, 83, *&c.*

† In Matth. pag. 332. Ὅτε μὲν ὁ Ἀνὴρ πρότερον πιστεύσας τῷ Χριστῷ σώζει τὴν Γυναῖκα, ὅτε δὲ ἡ Γυνὴ ἀξιαμένη ὑστερον ποτε πείθει τὸν Ἄνδρα.

and

and when the Wife believes first, she perſuades *her Husband.*

Dr. *Whitby* is very accurate in proving, the Words ſpeak only of ſeminal Holineſs; as is alſo the Right Reverend Biſhop of *Sarum* *: but if this were allow'd, it does not immediately follow, the Children muſt be baptiz'd, becauſe the Parents are Believers; which our Adverſarys take for granted, tho 'tis the very thing in Queſtion. And the whole Argument depends upon this *Petitio Principii*, as is plain if we put it into Form. All the Holy Seed, that is, all who are born of Chriſtian Parents, ought to be baptiz'd: but Infants are the Holy Seed; therefore Infants are to be baptiz'd.

Beſides, it can't be pretended that *ſanctify'd* means ſeminally Holy in the former Part of the Verſe; which makes it the more unlikely it means ſo in the latter Part, tho it ſhou'd ſignify ſo elſewhere.

Nay further, upon the Hypotheſis of ſome of our Adverſarys, which is alſo the moſt rational by far, what St. *Paul* ſays here is utterly falſe, and muſt appear ſo to all conſiderate Men. The only Reaſon why Infants are to be admitted to Baptiſm, St. *Paul* ſays, according to them, is, that one of the Parents is Chriſtian; but if ſo, then all others, tho brought to be baptiz'd by ever ſo good Suretys, are not to be admitted, for they are unclean: but this is contrary to GOD's infinite Goodneſs and Juſtice, and alſo to the Hypotheſis which the moſt judicious Pædobaptiſts now generally follow. And beſides, it gives the *Jewiſh* Diſpenſation the Advantage over the Chriſtian in this reſpect, that the Infants born of Heathen Parents might be brought to Circumciſion, and ſo enter'd

* *Articles*, pag. 305, 306.

into that Covenant; whereas, the Grace of CHRIST muſt be limited to narrower Bounds, while none can be admitted but thoſe born of at leaſt one Chriſtian Parent.

The juſteſt Interpretation which can be made upon our Author's own Principles, I think is that which he ſo much deſpiſes, namely, that by *Holineſs* is only meant *Legitimacy*. For if Proſelytiſm, among the *Jews*, diſſolv'd all natural Tyes and Relations, ſo as to make it lawful for a Man to marry his own Mother, *&c.* * becauſe ſhe cou'd now no longer be accounted his Mother; and if it made it unlawful for a Man to co-habit with his former Wife, ſhe being alſo no longer accounted his Wife; and if the Chriſtians thought their Regeneration to Chriſtianity as extenſive as that of the *Jews*, from whom they borrow'd this Notion †: what can be more proper and natural than to ſuppoſe, St. *Paul* is endeavouring to put better thoughts into his Converts, and perſuade 'em that their Proſelytiſm did not diſſolve natural Bonds and Conſanguinity; and that 'twas not only lawful, but adviſable, and a Duty for the Wife to dwell with her Husband? for he is ſtill her legitimate true Husband, otherwiſe indeed, ſays he, your Children wou'd be unclean, as Baſtards were accounted: but the Husband being legitimate, the Children are ſo too.

This Senſe is deriv'd from our Author's own Principles, and therefore, I think, he ought not to except againſt it. And it ſeems to be the true one, if we obſerve that the Holineſs of the Children is ſaid to reſult not, from the Chriſtianity of either Parent, but from the Husband's being ſanctify'd by, or to the Wife.

---

* Wall's Introd. pag. 21. † Ibid.

Now

Now what can this Holineſs be which ſprings from thence? The Baptiſm of the Parents can't ſerve for the Children; nor do I ſee that in any other Senſe, beſide what is given, the Sanctification of the Parents can denominate the Children Holy.

And tho I cannot allow of Mr. *Wall*'s Hypotheſis concerning the pretended *Jewiſh* Regeneration, yet I urge this to be the true Senſe of the Place, becauſe it's otherwiſe plain the *Jews* did not think it lawful to continue with a Stranger in Marriage, *Nehem.* xiii. 23, *&c.* as neither did the Chriſtians, as may appear from St. *Juſtin Martyr*'s Apology. And the *Greek* Church, even to this day, account it unlawful to marry with any out of their own Communion; for all ſuch they look upon as Heathens, out of the LORD; and the Children of ſuch Marriages are to them but Baſtards. Under the *Jewiſh* Diſpenſation indeed it was unlawful; but when CHRIST came, he diſallow'd the Divorces *Moſes* had tolerated for *the hardneſs of their Hearts*; it's true, he ſtill left it unlawful to marry *out of the* LORD; but as for Marriages already contracted in Unbelief, tho one Party afterwards became a Believer, the Chriſtian Law did not oblige to put away the other who did not believe; for CHRIST allows no Cauſe of Divorce, *but Fornication only.* Since then a miſtake in this Doctrine did ariſe in the Church, and St. *Paul* is expreſly ſpeaking of this very Caſe, and endeavouring to convince 'em, as appears by the whole Context, of their Error, what can be more natural, than to take the Words in the Senſe Mr. *Wall* ſo ſcornfully rejects?

But however, I think 'tis paſt all doubt, the word *Holy* cannot ſignify *baptiz'd*, as Mr. *Wall* wou'd have it, and none of his Inſtances prove it does: *Levit.* vi. 27. for Example, only expreſſes,

that whatever touch'd the Fleſh of the Sin-Offering ſhou'd *be ſanctify'd*; the Word is general, and muſt be underſtood to mean, according to the Directions given in the Law, and imports no more: and if they ſanctify'd ſuch things by waſhing, it was not from any ſuch Senſe in the word *Sanctify*, which ſignifys no one way more than another; but from particular Precepts which determin'd the way of Sanctifying: as in ſome Caſes it was by making ſuch things as *abide the Fire to go through the Fire*, Numb. xxxi. 23. and in this of touching the Fleſh of a Sin-Offering, perhaps it was by waſhing, tho this is not expreſs'd; but if it were, why ſhou'd we hence pretend *Sanctify* means *Waſh*, any more than that it ſignifys to *Anoint*, becauſe in *Exod.* xxix. 36. 'tis ſaid of the Altar, *Thou ſhalt Anoint it to Sanctify it?* And, in ſhort, why may not *Sanctify'd* and *Holy*, in the Paſſage in diſpute, be underſtood in the ſame Senſe in which our Lord ſays, *The Temple Sanctifys the Gold*, and that *the Altar Sanctifys the Gift*, Matt. xxiii. 17, 19? Here is plainly no manner of reference to *Waſhing*. Why may not the Husband be ſanctify'd by the Wife, and the Children by both, in the ſame Senſe as the Gold is ſanctify'd by the Temple, whatever that be? And the Senſe I put upon the Words will appear the more probable, if it be obſerv'd, that the *Jews* uſe קדוש to ſignify *chaſt*, as *Caſtellus* notes on the Word, and קדשה for a *Harlot*. And *Buxtorf* † informs us, The Word was us'd by the *Rabbins* to expreſs *the Conſecration of the Bride to the Bridegroom*, &c. *in Marriage:* and ſo ‖ קדוש is us'd for the *thing*, (viz.

† Lexic. Talmud. ad Voc. Col. 1978. Apud Rabbinos præterea קדש ſynechdochicè dicitur de Conſecratione Sponſæ ad Conjugium.

‖ Ibid. Col. 1980. Res ipſa, per quam fit Deſponſatio, veluti Annulus aut Donum, quo deſponſatur Puella.

the

the *Ring* or *Gift*) *by which the Ceremony of Betrothing is perform'd.* And so the third Book of the *Seder*, נשים, is call'd קדושין; because it treats of Matrimonial Contracts, the several Ways of Betrothing and Consecrating, and decides many difficult Cases which arise on these points. All this is highly in favour of the Exposition I give, while our Adversarys can make no use of St. *Paul*'s Words, till they can prove that by *holy* he meant baptiz'd; or else, that because Children are here said to be holy, they must therefore be baptiz'd, which they are pleas'd generally to take for granted.

The next Author Mr. *Wall* argues from is *Origen.* And here indeed we confess, the Passages cited are very full and plain Testimonys for Infant-Baptism; for as Mr. *Wall* says, † *The Plainness is such as needs nothing to be said of it, nor admits any thing to be said against it.* But yet we may observe,

1. That these, which are the only direct, clear Passages yet produc'd to our Author's purpose, are not *Origen*'s own Words, but taken from a licentious *Latin* Translation; while not the least colour of any thing can be urg'd from what remains of that Father's in the *Greek*, and yet we have more of his in the *Greek* than of any Father who wrote before him. And, I think, this is very remarkable, that what *Origen* says in favour of Infant-Baptism, shou'd be all in those *Latin* Translations, and nothing of the same nature to be met with in such considerable Remains in the *Greek.* Some indeed cite a Passage from the *Greek*, which Mr. *Wall* thinks is better let alone; for the whole Force of it, he says, de-

† Part I. pag. 35.

pends upon an artful leaving out ſuch Words as puzzle the Cauſe: had they been indeed left out in the Original by *Origen*, Mr. *Wall* thinks † *he muſt then have been underſtood of Infants in Age.* But I ſee no ſuch Neceſſity of this; the Place, it's true, had been much more doubtful, and perhaps might as well have been underſtood of ſuch, as of Men reſembling Infants: but it cou'd not have been neceſſary to underſtand it of Infants in Age; for why might not *Origen* have meant the ſame thing he does now, tho he had not expreſs'd himſelf ſo clearly?

But ſince the Words are put in, they unavoidably ſhew he did not ſpeak of Infants in Age: and Sir *Peter King*'s proving the ſame Word is at ſome Pages diſtance us'd by *Origen* for Infants in Age, does not prove it muſt mean ſo here too. The Father is ſpeaking of Guardian Angels, and puts this Queſtion, *Whether they take the Care and Management of Perſons, from the time when they by the waſhing of Regeneration, whereby they were new-born, do, as new-born Babes, deſire the ſincere Milk of the Word*, &c. It's ſtrange Mr. *Wall* ſhou'd ſay, after all his Pretences to Impartiality and Fairneſs, that the ‖ *mention of their deſiring of the ſincere Milk of the Word at the time of their Baptiſm, makes it doubtful* (only) *whether he meant Infants in a proper Senſe:* for it can be no doubt to any Man in his wits, whether Infants of a Month or two can deſire the ſincere Milk of the Word. But Mr. *Wall* goes on to obſerve, that the Anſwer *Origen* gives to this Queſtion increaſes the Doubt; and this he grounds upon theſe Words, *The time of Peoples Unbelief is under the Angels of Satan: and*

† Part I. pag. 40.
‖ Part I. pag. 41.

then

then after their new Birth, he that has bought us with his own Blood, delivers 'em to a good Angel. I am confident no body can imagine these Words are spoken of Infants; and therefore, quite contrary to Mr. *Wall*'s Pretence, they take away all Ambiguity which might have been in the Words, and clearly shew, that *Origen* spoke, not of Infants in Age, but only of such *little ones as believe in* CHRIST.

Besides this, I don't remember any thing is cited from *Origen* in the *Greek*, which are his only Authentick Pieces: but many things might be strongly urg'd from thence against the Baptism of Infants. I have already cited on another occasion a Passage very much to this Purpose; and 'tis certain as to the rest, that wherever he speaks of Baptism, he speaks of it in relation to the Adult only.

2. But the next Observation I make, and which utterly invalidates all Mr. *Wall*'s Citations, is, That they are not only taken from Translations instead of Originals, but that those Translations are made with abundance of liberty, without keeping to the Sense of the Original, and therefore they cannot be thought Authentick enough to ground an Argument upon 'em; for we can never know what *Origen* says, from what the Translators have alter'd and inserted. The Translations of the Fathers, 'tis notorious, have a very bad Name, and those of *Origen* in particular.

Cassiodorus, somewhere speaking of *Clemens Alexandrinus*'s Commentarys on the Canonical Epistles, says, || *He has expres'd many things very acutely,*

|| Cassiodor. Inst. Divin. Lect. Lib. 1. Ubi multa subtiliter sed aliqua incautè locutus est: quæ nos ita transferri fecimus in Latinum, ut exclusis quibusdam Offendiculis, purificata Doctrina ejus securior possit hauriri.

and

and ſome very unwarily; which we have caus'd to be tranſlated into Latin, *in ſuch a manner, as, omitting what might give offence, his pure and wholeſom Doctrine might be the more ſafely imbib'd.* And as to *Origen* in particular, *Grotius* ſays, * *A great deal of what is aſcrib'd to him is an unknown Author's, and a great deal is interpolated.* And *Huetius*, who has perhaps taken the moſt pains with *Origen* of any Man, ſays † in general of his Remains, that they are very imperfect and much abus'd, or elſe chang'd and *deform'd by abominable Tranſlations.* Mr. *Daillé* ‖ makes his Earnings of this, and notes that Ruffinus *has ſo filthily mangled, and ſo licentiouſly confounded the Writings of* Origen, *&c. which he has tranſlated into* Latin, *that you will hardly find a Page where he has not retrench'd, or added, or alter'd ſomething.* Mr. *Du Pin* ſeveral times repeats the ſame thing, and ſays, ** *Thoſe Pieces we have in* Latin *are tranſlated by* Ruffinus *and others, with ſo much liberty, that it is a difficult matter to diſcern what is* Origen's *own, from what has been foiſted in by the Interpreter.* In another Place he ſays, †† *Ruffinus gave himſelf a great deal of Liberty in his Tranſlations, and kept more to the Senſe which he judg'd ought to be given to Authors, than to their Words. In ſhort, his Tranſlations are Paraphraſes rather than literal and faithful Verſions. He hath us'd much freedom particularly in* Euſebius's *Hiſtory, and in* Origen's *Treatiſes, where he has chang'd, added and ſtruck out many things, as he acknowledges himſelf.* And again, St. *Hierom*, he ſays, |||| *ſomewhere upbraids him with*

* In Matth. xix. 14. Cui quæ aſcribuntur quædam ſunt incerti Autoris, quædam interpolata.

† Origenian. Lib. 3. cap. 2. Sect. 3. §. 1. Perverſis Interpretationibus deformatæ.

‖ De uſu Patrum, Lib. 1. cap. 4.

** Hiſt. Eccleſ. Vol. 1. pag. 117.

†† Ibid. Vol. 3. pag. 108.

|||| Ibid. Vol. 1. pag. 132. (r).

it:

it: Besides, this appears by the Translation it self, which is full of Figures, and Allusions to Latin *Words; of Terms taken in another Sense than what they were in* Origen's *time, where the* TRINITY, *and other Mysterys are expres'd in such Terms as were not us'd till after the Council of* Nice, *and where there are Points of Discipline more modern than* Origen's *Age; which has given occasion to those who have not consider'd the liberty* Ruffinus *took of adding or leaving out what he pleas'd, to doubt whether the greatest Part of these Works were* Origen's *or no. The liberty which* Ruffinus *has given himself is still more evident, by what he has written in the Prologue to this Version of the Commentary upon the Epistle to the* Romans, *which, he says, he has abridg'd by above the Half. St.* Hierom's *Versions are not more exact.* To these we may add an Expression of *Tarinus, in his Notes on the* Philocalia, * *who says,* Ruffinus *has perverted the whole Proem, and, as he usually does, altogether forsakes the Original.*

And all this is abundantly evident, not only from this Cloud of unexceptionable Witnesses, but also from comparing the Versions with the Originals as now extant, which you may do at your leisure, and also from their own Confessions in the several Introductions and Closes publish'd together with the Translations.

What Man in the World cou'd persuade himself that an Argument may be founded on such Versions? For how can he know whether *Origen* spoke any thing like what he now reads, since the Translators were so scandalously guilty of altering and putting in what they pleas'd? And since Mr. *Wall* allows this too, he to be sure shou'd not have urg'd these Passages.

---

* Ad Cap. 1. pag. 1. ver. 28. Totum porro hoc Proemium *Ruffinus* contorsit, & ut solet in alia omnia abiit.

But

But to this Objection, which he owns is very conſiderable, he anſwers, 1. That tho *Ruffinus* was ſo guilty in this Point, yet St. *Hierom* took a more faithful Method, * *expreſſing every thing as it was in the Original*: and therefore, ſince the Paſſage he tranſcribes from the Commentarys on St. *Luke*, tranſlated by St. *Hierom*, contains the ſame thing in effect with thoſe tranſcrib'd from *Ruffinus*'s Tranſlations, it is to be ſuppos'd *Ruffinus* alter'd nothing in thoſe Particulars.

But, Sir, you need only compare St. *Hierom*'s Tranſlations with the Originals, to ſee that his *Verſions*, as Monſieur *du Pin* ſays, *are not more exact* than thoſe of *Ruffinus*; many things he has left out, and given a different Turn to others, as might be ſhewn in abundance of Inſtances. His Verſion of *Euſebius*'s *Chronicon* is a great Example of his Liberty in tranſlating: as is alſo his Book *de Locis Hebraicis*, in the Preface of which he confeſſes he has omitted what he thought not worth remembring, and alter'd the greateſt part of it. Nay, he owns, † he took ſuch a freedom in tranſlating *Origen*, as to ſtrike out what was dangerous, and leave only that which was uſeful; which made *Scaliger* ‖ ſay, St. *Hierom* was but a bad Tranſlator.

2. In the next Place our Author pretends, that whatever might have been alter'd and interpolated in other Matters, there is no manner of Probability any thing was done ſo in the Point of Infant-Baptiſm; becauſe it was none of the Subjects on which *Origen*'s Opinion was queſtion'd, at that time. But Mr. *Wall* might as well pre-

---

* Part I. p. 36.

† Epiſt 62. ad Theoph. Alex.
Et Lib. 2. Apol. contra Ruffin.

‖ Scaligerana, p. 191.

tend

tend they *left out* nothing but what related to those Points, as that they *alter'd* nothing else, which however wou'd be false. And you may remember, Monsieur *du Pin* observes that the Translations contain several Points of Discipline more modern than *Origen*'s Age: and tho they took particular care of those things which were disputed, yet it does not follow they made no manner of Alteration in any others: on the contrary, 'tis very likely, they who had once given themselves a liberty to make their Author speak their Thoughts, have done it oftner than we are aware. And that they did so, you will be convinc'd by revising *Origen*'s Fragments with their Translations; where, thro Ignorance or Carelesness, or whatever might be the Cause, there are a great many Deviations from the Originals in Passages which don't concern the Points on which *Origen*'s Opinion was question'd.

Besides, when the Translators own the Fact so fully, and warn their Readers of the great Alterations they have made, it is not to be suppos'd they wou'd be understood to have alter'd only those things which were disputed, but that they alter'd so much, that some People thought they shou'd rather have publish'd the Work under their own Names, as the Authors, and not as Translators; which appears from the *Peroration* at the end of the Version of the Commentary upon the Epistle to the *Romans*. And in *Ruffinus*'s Version of the Fragment of this Commentary, which makes the 25th Chapter of the *Philocalia*, there are hardly any Footsteps of the Original preserv'd, or any thing in which they agree.

3. In the third Place, our Author says, tho *Ruffinus* usually took such a Latitude, and so strangely alter'd the Commentary on *Leviticus* more especially, yet he dealt otherwise with that on the Epistle

Epiſtle to the *Romans*, from which the principal Citation is taken: for *Ruffinus* only ſays, *he had* ſhorten'd this Work by one half, *but ſpeaks of no Addition. And it is in this*, ſays our Author, *that there is mention of the Tradition from the Apoſtles*, that Baptiſm ſhou'd be given to Infants. Obſerve the Inference; a Man who was wont to put out, inſert, and change whatever he pleas'd with an unbounded Liberty, muſt now be ſuppos'd only to have ſhorten'd the Work without any Addition or Change, becauſe he only ſays *he had ſhorten'd it*, and does not ſay he added any thing to it: but neither does he ſay the contrary, and therefore 'tis unreaſonable to ſuppoſe he acted here differently from his conſtant Practice.

Nay, he confeſſes, he has added many things of his own; for he ſays, ‖ *that there was a great deal of the Body of the Book wanting, in all Librarys.* And this he has endeavour'd in ſome meaſure to ſupply. And in the *Peroration*, he adds, † *They tell me, there is ſo much of your own in theſe things, that you ought to call 'em by your own Name, and entitle the Work*, An Explication of the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, by *Hierom*, *for example*, &c. which is a ſign there was leſs of *Origen* in this Work, than of the Tranſlator. To this *Ruffinus* anſwers, without denying the Charge: * *But I have more regard to my Conſcience, than to a great Name; and tho I add*

‖ Præfat. Deſunt fere apud omnium Bibliothecas (incertum ſanè quo Caſu) aliquanta ex ipſo Corpore Volumina.

† Aiunt enim mihi; in his quæ ſcribis, quoniam plurima in eis tui Operis habentur, da Titulum Nominis tui, & ſcribe Hieronymi (verbi gratia) in Epiſtolam ad Romanos Explanationum Libri.

* Verum ego qui plus Conſcientiæ meæ quam Nomini defero, etiamſi addere aliqua videor, & explere quæ deſunt,

add some things, and supply what was wanting, and shorten what seems too long, I don't think I therefore ought to put my own Name in the Title, and rob him of the Work who laid the Foundation, and furnish'd Materials for the Structure.

If therefore we may take *Ruffinus*'s own Word for it, he has made as free with this Commentary on the *Romans*, as with the other Pieces he translated. Which is likewise inconteſtably evident, if you compare, as I ſaid before, the 25th Chapter of the *Philocalia* with *Ruffinus*'s Verſion. Beſides, it may be added, that the Commentary was miſerably interpolated before *Ruffinus* took it in hand, which he complains of in the *Preface*; and therefore if he had been ever ſo faithful, no certain Argument cou'd be drawn from theſe Commentarys.

Mr. *Wall* cites another Paſſage from the Homilys on *Joſhua*, in theſe Words: *According to that Saying of our* LORD *concerning Infants, (and thou waſt an Infant when thou waſt baptiz'd) Their Angels do always behold the Face of my* FATHER *which is in Heaven.* And to ſtrengthen this, he ſays, † *Tho this Part of* Origen's *Works be not extant in* Greek, *yet we may the more depend upon it, becauſe* Ruffinus *aſſures us, that in the Tranſlation of theſe Homilys,* &c. *he has neither added nor omitted any thing, but truly render'd what he found in the* Greek *Books.* But,

1. It's doubtful, as Mr. *Wall* himſelf alſo notes, whether by *thou waſt an Infant when thou waſt baptiz'd*, he means an Infant in Age, or only in a ſpiritual Senſe. And,

---

ſunt, aut breviare quæ longa ſunt, furari tamen Titulum ejus qui Fundamentum Operis jecit, & conſtruendi Ædificii Materiam præbuit, rectum non puto.

† Part I. p. 42.

2. Tho

2. Tho *Ruffinus* ſays he has tranſlated theſe Homilys as he found them in the *Greek*, he only means in compariſon with the Liberty he uſually took with other Books: but that he added and very much alter'd even theſe Homilys too, can't well be doubted; for if we compare that Fragment of the 20th Homily, which is the 12th Chapter of the *Philocalia*, with his Tranſlation, you will ſee nothing can be more different; and particularly he inſerts theſe Words: *As the* LORD *ſaid of the little ones of the Church, that their Angels do always ſtand before the* LORD, *and ſee his Face.* Which are not in the *Greek* of *Origen*; and therefore, as *Ruffinus* has added 'em here of his own head, 'tis as probable he did ſo in the other Paſſage our Author cites. Thus, upon the whole, I think it ſufficiently appears, that what is urg'd from *Origen* for Pædobaptiſm, has no Force in it.

After *Origen*, St. *Cyprian* follows in Mr. *Wall*'s Quotations: who, I confeſs, does plainly enough ſpeak of Infant-Baptiſm, as practis'd in *Africa* in his time. But it is to be noted, he ſpeaks as plainly of Infant-Communion too; and therefore if his Authority is ſufficient for admitting Infants to one Sacrament, it ought to be allow'd ſufficient for the admitting 'em to the other alſo. 'Tis to be obſerv'd likewiſe, that the firſt mention we have of Infant-Baptiſm is from theſe *Carthaginian* Fathers, which makes it very probable that it began firſt at *Carthage*. It was attempted in *Tertullian*'s time; and he, you know, Sir, oppos'd it ſtrenuouſly. But notwithſtanding, it took footing there ſhortly after, and was very common in St. *Cyprian*'s time: and St. *Auſtin* thought it an Apoſtolical Tradition; juſt as Dipping, from being held neceſſary, was firſt diſpens'd with in ſome extraordinary Caſes, then counted indifferent, and afterwards wholly laid aſide, nay counted unlaw-

ful

ful too; and all within the space of half a Century here in *England:* and the Error grew as fast among the *Africans*, who were generally Men of weak Understandings. Mr. *Wall* himself makes *Fidus* but an indifferent Man for a Bishop, when he says, † *all he objected of Sense, was the Rule of Circumcision on the eighth Day.* And truly I must agree with him, there was not much Sense in the other things he urg'd, nor indeed in this neither: for he might as well have baptiz'd on the seventh Day, because GOD rested thereon; as on the eighth Day, because *Isaac* was circumcis'd thereon. But however, if *Fidus* was satisfy'd with St. *Cyprian*'s Answer, I think this far the greatest Argument of his Weakness, that he cou'd suffer himself to be impos'd on with so trifling and empty a Reply.

But tho the *African* Bishops were no wiser than to admit the Error, perhaps only as an indifferent thing, or in cases of Danger, the *Greek* Churches seem very plainly to have been still of another Opinion. For *Dionysius* the illustrious Bishop of *Alexandria*, in an Epistle to *Dionysius* a Presbyter, and afterwards Bishop of *Rome*, concerning *Novatian*, says, ‖ *he utterly disallows of holy Baptism, and subverts the Faith and Profession which goes before it.* As this great Man speaks of Baptism in general, so he must be understood to mean, that in his Judgment, there was, at that time, a Faith and Profession always to precede it. And it is impossible a Man who never dream'd of Infant-Baptism, shou'd speak more plainly against it:

† Part I. pag. 52.

‖ Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 7. cap. 8. Τὸ Λυτρὸν ἀθετῶν τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ τὴν τε περὶ αὐτὸ Πίστιν καὶ Ὁμολογίαν ἀνατρέπουσι.

nor can we expect to find any Paſſages more inconſiſtent with that Practice, than this is.

It will not be worth our while to examine how the Error advanc'd in after-times, and by what Arts and Changes it extended it ſelf, and became ſo univerſally eſtabliſh'd, as we ſee it at preſent. 'Tis ſufficient that the Scriptures, the only infallible Rule of our Faith and Practice, are found not to favour the Cauſe we diſown; and that the Authority of the primitive Fathers alſo for at leaſt 250 Years after CHRIST, give no Countenance to our Adverſarys, but are rather againſt them. I think, we have abundant reaſon therefore to perſiſt in the Opinion and Practice we profeſs, notwithſtanding the greateſt numbers of the moſt Learned and moſt Powerful are againſt us; and have been ſo, it may be, ſeveral hundred Years.

But to ſum up the Evidence ſomething more at large, I muſt deſire you to remember, it has been clearly prov'd,

I. Firſt in regard to the pretended Silence of the Scriptures: 1. That inſtead of yielding our Adverſarys any Argument, it follows ſtrongly from thence, that Pædobaptiſm can be no Inſtitution of CHRIST, as being no where mention'd in the only authentick Chriſtian Records. And therefore to teach and practiſe, and much more to impoſe it on others, as an Ordinance of CHRIST, is altogether unwarrantable. 2. That the Scriptures are not ſo ſilent in this reſpect, as is pretended; and that tho they do not expreſly mention and forbid to baptize Infants, they do yet require and make ſuch Conditions and Circumſtances neceſſary in thoſe who are to be admitted, as ſufficiently and unavoidably exclude Infants as much as if it had been ſaid expreſly, *Infants are not* to be baptiz'd. And this I prov'd by

ſhewing,

shewing, among other things, that the Commission, *Matth.* xxviii. 19. more especially, is so expres's'd, as by no means to admit of Infants. And here, to take off all the Pretences the Pædobaptists can be suppos'd to make, and withal the more strongly to enforce the Argument we draw from the Place, I have largely shewn, the *Greek* Word μαθητεύω always, but more especially in this Commission, necessarily includes teaching in its Signification: 1. By its Etymology, and the Analogy of the *Greek* Tongue; by many inconteſtable Instances of its use in the *Greek* Authors, whether Profane or Eccleſiastical, as well as in the Scriptures themselves, wherein it can be no otherwise understood; and by other synonymous Words and Phrases which frequently occur in parallel Cases. To all which I added, the Allowance and Confession of several of the most learned and judicious Writers, even Pædobaptists themselves. 2. By the constant and universal Agreement of all the Learned Versions, and as many vernacular ones as I have had opportunity of consulting, which all render the Word by *teach*. 3. By the Authority of the antient Fathers, who continually read and understand the Word in that Sense only. And lastly, by the more awful Authority of the Sacred Scriptures themselves, which do abundantly confirm our Sense of the Commission; by parallel Places, and other Allusions; and by shewing, that the Apostles understood and obey'd the Commission in this Sense only.

II. After this, I consider'd the pretended Practice of the *Jews*, which makes so much Noise among the Pædobaptists; and have shewn evidently, 1. That the Authoritys Mr. *Wall* cites from the *Jews* are not antient enough to assure us what was practis'd either before, in, or neat our SAVIOUR's time. 2. That none of the Passages

ſo much as aſſert or intimate in the leaſt, that the *Jews* baptiz'd Proſelytes in CHRIST's time, which was the thing to be prov'd. 3. That the beſt Paſſage Mr. *Wall* has, does not neceſſarily mean Baptiſm for Proſelytiſm, but may very probably ſpeak of ſomething elſe. 4. To theſe things I added, that ſome of the Rabbins do ſpeak againſt this Ceremony, and make it clear, they neither allow'd or knew of Proſelytory-Baptiſm, even in plainer Words than any cited by Mr. *Wall* for his Purpoſe. 5. And then utterly to invalidate all that is or can be ſaid from the *Jewiſh* Writings, I have ſhewn, by a great many Paſſages taken from their beſt Authors, and by the Teſtimony of the greateſt Judges, that the Rabbins in general are ſuch proud, falſe, ſenſeleſs, whimſical, ſcandalous Writers, as can never be depended on in any Caſe; which makes their Authority the moſt deſpicable and inſignificant in the World: and therefore the Baptiſm grounded on this Foundation can be only a ſenſeleſs Rabbinical Tradition.

I have alſo conſider'd the Paſſage he cites from *Arrian*; and ſhewn, 1. That this is likewiſe not antient enough. 2. That he may, for ought appears to the contrary, ſpeak only of the Waſhings for Pollution, and not for Proſelytiſm. 3. That he very probably ſpeaks only of the Chriſtians, whom he confounded with the *Jews* in this, as he has undoubtedly done in other Places: and thus ſeveral learned Men have underſtood it.

And as to his next Argument from *Gregory Nazianzen*, and other Fathers, I have ſhewn, 1. That their Authority in this Caſe ſignifys nothing, as being too late. 2. That they can't well be underſtood to ſpeak of any thing but the Legal Waſhings for Uncleanneſſes: and therefore all Mr. *Wall* advances to prove his Poſition, that the *Jews* in

in our SAVIOUR's time us'd to baptize their Proselytes, indeed proves nothing at all.

And after all this, to confirm, as far as a Negative can be prov'd, that the *Jews* had no such Custom as is pretended, I have shewn, 1. That the Scriptures make no mention in the least of any such Baptism; and that *Exod.* xix. 10. particularly, can't be thought to do it. 2. That there is no Instance or Intimation of such Baptism in any other authentick antient History, but on the contrary a total Silence, when they not only had the fairest Occasions, but also ought to have mention'd that Custom, if they had known it. 3. That the Pretence of the Pædobaptists is very improbable. 4. That several considerable Authors, especially the Antients, do in effect deny they knew of any Initiatory-Baptism among the *Jews*; and in their Discourses on the *Jewish* Ceremonys, never mention this as one: all which put together, I suppose, can't well be thought any thing short of proving, the *Jews* had no such Ceremony.

But besides all this, I have, from several other Considerations, shewn, that tho it cou'd have been prov'd ever so certainly, that the *Jews* baptiz'd their Proselytes, this can do no Service to the Cause of Pædobaptism; because, 1. It does not appear that their *Infants* were admitted to that Baptism. 2. Supposing Proselytes and their Children were usually baptiz'd by the *Jews*, it does not follow their Baptism must be a Rule for the Practice of Christians; for according to the Pædobaptists themselves, there is no manner of Analogy between 'em. 3. Because our Practice shou'd rather be regulated by that of St. *John* and CHRIST, than by that of the *Jews*; and they, we are sure, as far as the Scripture can inform us, baptiz'd no Children. And lastly, because it is evident, that

at moſt this ſuppos'd Baptiſm is but a Rabbinical Tradition. For, 1. It's no where mention'd in the Scriptures. 2. The *Jews* themſelves acknowledg it to be ſo; and the Phraſe of the *Talmud* in thoſe very Inſtances cited by our Antagoniſts, even according to *Maimonides* his Explication, imports, that it was neither inſtituted by *Moſes*, nor can be concluded from any thing he writ, nor from any Tradition from him, but is only founded in the loweſt Authority of the Rabbins: and this Leven CHRIST has frequently enough caution'd us to beware of. And therefore, at laſt, from all it muſt follow, that the Pretences our Antagoniſts make from the ſuppos'd *Jewiſh* Practice and Writings, can ſignify nothing to the Support of Pædobaptiſm.

III. And then thirdly, as to the Doctrine and Practice of the antient Church, which Mr. *Wall* chiefly argues from; I have conſider'd the three firſt Centurys, and ſhewn, 1. in general, That their Authority alone is not ſufficient to bear the Weight of Infant-Baptiſm, tho they ſhou'd be found to aſſert it univerſally. 2. Mr. *Wall* forbears to mention St. *Barnabas*, who has ſome Paſſages inconſiſtent with Pædobaptiſm. 3. St. *Clemens Romanus*, with whom our Author begins, and who, he ſays without any ground, ſpeaks of Original Sin as affecting all Mankind, does not however ſpeak of Infant-Baptiſm, nor ſeem on any account whatever to have had it in his Thoughts.

And whereas Mr. *Wall* argues, upon the Suppoſition that St. *Clemens* eſteems all Perſons tainted with Original Sin, that he likewiſe thought all ought to be baptiz'd; I have obſerv'd, 1. That the Premiſes as well as the Concluſion, are not St. *Clement*'s, but Mr. *Wall*'s only. 2. Or ſecondly, That at beſt, according to our Author, this only

only shews what was St. *Clement*'s Judgment, and not what was the Practice of the Church. Now tho the Church in general had these Speculations, it won't at all follow they ventur'd barely upon that account to practise accordingly. 3. That 'tis all grounded on that uncharitable Error, That none can be sav'd without being baptiz'd. 4. That Baptism does not appear to have been administer'd so much for Original, as for Actual Sins. And lastly, That it no more follows from that Principle that the antient Church practis'd Infant-Baptism, than that all the Antipædobaptists do so now; for they likewise hold the common Notion of Original Sin.

IV. As to St. *Hermas*, Mr. *Wall*'s next Author, I have shewn, 1. That he speaks only of Adult Persons who have heard, and believe. 2. That he only describes Visions, and therefore is not always to be taken literally. 3. That he cannot be thought to mean, that those he represents to have been baptiz'd in their separate Estate after Death, were actually baptiz'd with material Water. 4. That if we shou'd give our Author his whole Argument, it wou'd only prove *Hermas* was of opinion that Infants shall be baptiz'd in their separate State after Death, which is nothing to our Controversy.

In arguing from this Father, Mr. *Wall* compares some Words of his with our LORD's Saying, *John* iii. 5. *Except a Man*, &c. which gives me occasion to examine the Argument the Pædobaptists draw from thence. And I have, I think, fully shewn, 1. That the Words cannot be taken so universally, as to comprehend Infants. 2. That by *Kingdom of GOD* 'tis not necessary to understand the Kingdom of Glory. 3. That our SAVIOUR's Words refer only to Adult Persons, who have heard the Word preach'd: 1. Because such only can possibly comply with the Institution. 2. Such

only can be ſav'd by Baptiſm. 3. What's there ſaid, cannot be true of any other. And laſtly, ſomething in the Words themſelves neceſſarily limits 'em to Adult Perſons.

In the ſame manner Mr. *Wall* gives me occaſion likewiſe to examine what may be urg'd from *Matth.* xix. 14. *Suffer little Children*, &c. And I obſerve, 1. That the Words have no relation to Baptiſm at all. But, 2. That the Children were only brought to be touch'd and bleſs'd. 3. That this was probably in order to heal them, or the like, and cou'd not be as Dr. *Lightfoot* and Dr. *Whitby* ſuppoſe, to *own 'em as belonging to His Kingdom*, nor *to obtain for 'em ſome ſpiritual Bleſſing appertaining to the Kingdom of* GOD. 4. And laſtly, That it does not follow from our LORD's ſaying, *of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven*, that there is, as Dr. *Whitby* aſſerts, any thing in little Children why they ſhou'd be brought to CHRIST, beſides their being Emblems of Humility; much leſs, that they are fit to be early dedicated to the Service of GOD, *&c.* by the Chriſtian Baptiſm.

V. After he has done with St. *Hermas*, Mr. *Wall* comes next to St. *Juſtin Martyr*. The firſt Paſſage he cites is only to ſhew, that he ſpake of Original Sin as affecting all Mankind. But I ſhew, 1. That if it were ſo, this is nothing to Infant-Baptiſm. 2. That St. *Juſtin* cannot fairly be underſtood to ſpeak of Original Sin at all. 3. That Mr. *Wall* has very much miſrepreſented him, and given a wrong Tranſlation of the Words in favour of his Aſſertion.

The next Paſſage which, ſpeaking of ſpiritual Circumciſion, ſays, *ſome have receiv'd it by Baptiſm*, Mr. *Wall* thinks is as much as to ſay, Children ought to be baptiz'd as well as they were wont to be circumcis'd. But I have clearly ſhewn, 1. That St. *Juſtin* does not call Baptiſm Circumciſion.

2. That

2. That he cou'd not mean Baptism by the spiritual Circumcision he mentions, both from these Words themselves, and several other Passages in his Writings, which sufficiently evidence what he understood to be the Christian Spiritual Circumcision.

Here, to strengthen his Assertions, our Author compares some Words of St. *Justin* with *Col.* ii. 11, 12. where he supposes, St. *Paul* by the Circumcision there spoken of, means Baptism. In answer to which, I observe, 1. That the Scriptures no where call Baptism Circumcision: but that Purity of Heart, *&c.* is frequently call'd so. 2. That the Words in themselves are such as cannot admit of so absurd an Acceptation. 3. That the Antients can't be thought to have understood 'em so. 4. That besides, if this were the meaning of St. *Justin* and St. *Paul* too, it does not follow, that the *Jewish* Practice, in regard to Circumcision under the Law, must be our Rule in regard to Baptism now. For, 1. Infants were *commanded* to be circumcis'd then, but are *not commanded* to be baptiz'd now. 2. Circumcision was to be on the eighth Day precisely, which cannot be urg'd of Baptism. 3. Females were not to be circumcis'd then, and therefore it wou'd as well follow they must not be baptiz'd now. 4. The Apostles did not make Circumcision their Rule in relation to Baptism.

The next Passage Mr. *Wall* produces from St. *Justin*, notwithstanding his Pretences, argues very strongly against Infant-Baptism: but he says, he cites it only to shew, 1. What was the most antient way of baptizing. Which Observation I turn directly against the *English* Pædobaptists particularly. 2. *That the Christians of those Times us'd the Word* Regeneration *for Baptism.* But this Observation I have shewn to be false,

falſe, 1. From the Words themſelves. And, 2. From other Paſſages in St. *Juſtin*. But the third thing for which Mr. *Wall* cites this Paſſage of St. *Juſtin* is, becauſe he pretends it ſhews they underſtood *John* iii. 5. *of Water-Baptiſm; and concluded from it, that* none can be ſav'd *without ſuch Baptiſm*. Which however, it's plain, can't be St. *Juſtin*'s meaning; for Mr. *Wall* himſelf allows St. *Juſtin*'s Words relate only to Adult Perſons, and not to Infants.

In the next, which is the laſt Citation from this Father, our Author makes him ſay, ſome were diſcipl'd to CHRIST; that is, as he underſtands it, baptiz'd *in their Childhood*, even in the Apoſtles times. But this Senſe I have ſhewn to be violently and wrongfully impos'd upon St. *Juſtin*, by a very falſe and unfair Tranſlation of his Words.

VI. After this comes St. *Irenæus*, who is the firſt, as Mr. *Wall* allows, that makes expreſs mention of Infant-Baptiſm; for he talks of *Infants*, &c. being *regenerated to GOD*. And this is generally thought an unanſwerable Inſtance. But I have fully ſhewn, *Firſt*, That upon ſeveral Accounts nothing can be more probable than that the Paſſage, and all the latter part of the Chapter, is ſpurious. 1. Becauſe it contradicts the beginning of it. 2. It's aſſerted, St. *John* and other Apoſtles taught a very groſs Falſhood. 3. St. *Irenæus* cou'd not but know the LORD's Age much more exactly than this part of the Chapter makes him do: (1.) From the memorable things which attended his Birth and Sufferings. (2.) From his Acquaintance with thoſe who had convers'd with the Apoſtles. (3.) From the Diſcourſes then extant, to ſhew when the MESSIAS was to come and ſuffer. (4.) It appears even from St. *Irenæus*'s own Writings, that he

he cou'd not believe CHRIST was near so old as this Passage makes Him; for he fixes the time of his Birth, and cou'd not but know the time of his Death: 1. By the famous Event of the Destruction of *Jerusalem.* 2. From *Phlegon*, who wrote but a little before him. 3. From computing the Years of the Emperors according to their common Reckonings; or particularly from *Josephus.* *Secondly*, This Quotation is taken from a very corrupt Translation only; as is prov'd, 1. By the Authority of learned Men. 2. By several Instances wherein the Translator appears to have chang'd, added to, or taken from the Sense of the Original.

Besides this, I have shewn, that if the Passage were genuine, and well translated, 1. It does not speak of Baptism; and that it is not true to assert, as Mr. *Wall* does, that the Antients always by *regenerate*, &c. mean baptiz'd: nay, I have prov'd by many Instances, that they never mean so; particularly that *John* iii. 5. and *Titus* iii. 5. cannot be so understood; and that St. *Irenæus* has not us'd the Word so once in all his Writings. 2. The Place does not speak of Infants in our common Acceptation, of one or two Years old, but comprehends all to ten Years of Age. From all which, I think, it necessarily follows, that nothing hitherto advanc'd by Mr. *Wall* can do the Cause of Pædobaptism any Service.

VII. Next we come to *Tertullian*, who Mr. *Wall* says speaks of the Necessity of Baptism in such general Terms as to reckon *those that die unbaptiz'd as lost Men.* But I have shewn, he says as much of the *Necessity* of *Faith*, &c. and therefore this Observation is no Argument against us. And as to his express mention of Infant-Baptism, when he opposes it, that does not necessarily argue, as

our

our Adverſarys wou'd have it, that it was commonly practis'd at that time; only that ſome were endeavouring to introduce it. Again, *Tertullian* does not, as Mr. *Wall* pretends, ſimply adviſe to defer the Baptiſm of Children, but argues againſt it from their unfitneſs, *&c.* as a thing which ought not to be done. And in other places he ſpeaks of Baptiſm in ſuch Terms as are utterly inconſiſtent with Pædobaptiſm.

As to *Tertullian*'s Application of 1 *Cor.* vii. 14. I have obſerv'd, 1. His Senſe of it is far from favouring our Antagoniſts. 2. Mr. *Wall* does not attempt to prove that *Tertullian* or any Writer of the three firſt Centurys underſtood the Words to relate at all to Baptiſm. Hence I take occaſion to examine the Pretences from St. *Paul*'s Words, and to ſtate the true Senſe of 'em. Here I obſerve, 1. That all Mr. *Wall*'s pains to prove ἁγιος, *&c.* mean *waſh'd* or *baptiz'd*, is to no purpoſe; for thoſe Words neither ſignify ſo here, or any where elſe. 2. That the moſt rational Interpretation of the Words is that which Mr. *Wall* ſo ſcornfully rejects, concerning Legitimacy: which is prov'd, 1. Upon our Author's own Principles. 2. From the Deſign and Context. 3. It is confirm'd by the Practice and Ways of ſpeaking among the *Jews* and *Chriſtians*.

VIII. To theſe ſucceeds *Origen*; from whom, I confeſs, Mr. *Wall* cites ſome plain Paſſages to his Purpoſe: but their whole force is taken off by obſerving, 1. That they are not cited from his *Greek* Remains, but only from the *Latin* Tranſlations. 2. That theſe are very bad, and made with the greateſt Licence in the World, as appears both from the Judgment of learned Men, and from ſeveral Inſtances. 3. That tho Mr. *Wall* ſays the contrary, St. *Hierom*, by his own Confeſſion, was not

not more faithful than *Ruffinus*. 4. That the Translators have not taken a Liberty with what related to those Opinions only of *Origen* which were then disputed, as Mr. *Wall* objects. 5. That *Ruffinus*, whatever Mr. *Wall* pretends, has dealt as unfairly with the Commentary on the *Romans*, from whence the principal Citation is taken, as he was us'd to do with others. So that nothing can be infer'd from any of those Citations out of *Origen*.

Thus I have follow'd Mr. *Wall* for about 250 Years, and shewn, I think, beyond all Contradiction, that there is not the least colour in any thing yet advanc'd for Infant-Baptism within that Period. St. *Cyprian* indeed, who comes next, and others after him, I acknowledg speak of it: but how far they allow'd of it, or made it necessary, and in what Cases, *&c.* or how it came to be so universally receiv'd at last, 'tis not worth our while to enquire: for as the earliest Times are much the most considerable and pure, what can't be prov'd to have been taught or practis'd in them, we shall not be very forward to admit of now, barely upon the Authority of the more corrupt Centurys, when an infinite number of Innovations and Errors were introduc'd. 'Tis enough for us that it can't be prov'd CHRIST instituted this Practice, or that the Scriptures justify it, or that for the first 50 Years, or less, it was at all known: but since we are able to go so much farther still, and have abundant ground to deny it was us'd till above two hundred Years after CHRIST; and that notwithstanding all the pains our Adversarys have taken to prove the contrary, you see, Sir, there is indeed nothing in whatever they advance which can in the least favour their Opinion; can any thing be more just and necessary, than that we continue to think and

act

act as formerly? Doubtleſs, all impartial Judges muſt give Sentence in our Favour. And for theſe Reaſons it was, I think, altogether needleſs to follow Mr. *Wall* any farther; and therefore I have neglected all the reſt of his Hiſtory. And indeed, there was no manner of neceſſity for his carrying his Account ſo far. If he had only prov'd Infant-Baptiſm was practis'd in the firſt Century, he might very well have ſpar'd the reſt of his pains; for we ſhou'd not then have diſputed with him the Practice of thoſe who liv'd afterwards. But as matters ſtood, I muſt allow he was in the right of it, not to ſtop till he found Infant-Baptiſm fully ſettl'd; and therefore he runs on ſo far as St. *Auſtin*; for there is no Author ſooner who ſpeaks ſo effectually to his Purpoſe.

Before I conclude, Sir, I muſt juſt take notice of one thing I remember you were us'd frequently to object, *viz.* That we are not able to aſſign the Time when Infant-Baptiſm firſt commenc'd; and that it muſt ſeem mighty ſtrange, and indeed improbable to ſuch as reflect upon the great Piety and Sincerity of the early Centurys of the Church, that an Innovation of this nature ſhou'd ever be in the leaſt attempted, and much more that it ſhou'd prevail ſo far, and be ſo generally own'd and defended, and all ſo early as even we our ſelves acknowledg it was. But, Sir, I muſt beg you to conſider,

1. That very many Errors of as groſs a kind were as ſoon ſtarted, and as generally receiv'd as the baptizing of Infants: for the truth of this, I appeal to the Church Hiſtorys, which abundantly make it appear, and all learned Men acknowledg it. Monſieur *Jurieu* has given a Catalogue of divers of 'em in his eighth and ſome following Paſtoral Letters

Letters for the Year 1686: and Monsieur *du Pin* has noted many Alterations at the end of the three first and of the fourth Centurys, in his Ecclesiastical History.

2. You are not to imagine this Practice was establish'd altogether, and at once, in as great a Latitude as it is at present. It began, doubtless, at first, as all other Innovations do, with only some little Variations in Opinions, and then past to as little in Practice; and so by very short Steps, at length, attain'd unobserv'd the great Reputation it has now indeed for a long time enjoy'd. And all this might be done in a very short time, as I have often observ'd to you it happen'd in the manner of administring this Sacrament here in *England*: for Dipping was wholly laid aside, and Sprinkling us'd in its stead, in less than half a Century; (even as our Adversarys themselves still confess) tho directly contrary to CHRIST's Direction, to a Decree of a Synod under *Kenwolfe*, the express Words of the Service-Book, and without any Allowance, *&c.* and sure no Alteration can be more bold than this is.

3. Lastly, that very Piety and Zeal you mention as a Security against this Innovation, in reality tended very much to betray 'em into it. 'Tis true, it wou'd hardly suffer 'em to lose any thing they had receiv'd, but 'twas not so inconsistent with their adding many things. And accordingly we see that from the very beginning it had this Influence. Hence came the Anointing the new-baptiz'd, and giving 'em Milk and Honey to eat, *&c.* which are very early mention'd. 'Twas the Piety of the Antients that made 'em think and speak such high things of the Sacramental Supper, which by degrees brought 'em to speak of it as of a real Sacrifice; and then they were continually talking

talking of Offerings and Altars, *&c.* Upon this, others ſoon began to underſtand thoſe Expreſſions literally, and to attribute much to the Power of the Prieſts Conſecration, which eaſily led People to eſteem the Elements of a moſt holy Nature after that Ceremony: all which prepar'd 'em to underſtand our LORD's Words, *This is my Body*, in that very abſurd Senſe many ſo ſtrenuouſly plead for. And then the moſt pious Diſpoſitions, upon theſe Miſtakes, might well think the *Maſs* a meritorious and expiatory Sacrifice, wherein the very Body of CHRIST was not *offer'd up once for all*, but every day, for the Sins of the People: and all this muſt work 'em into the higheſt Veneration for the tranſubſtantiated Wafer; and no wonder if at length they ran into the Idolatrous Adoration of it, and other Foppery's, which naturally attend ſuch Extravagancys.

Much after the ſame manner Infant-Baptiſm ſeems plainly to have been introduc'd. They ſoon began to talk in very lofty Hyperboles concerning the powerful Effects and Neceſſity of Baptiſm: and at firſt indeed this was meant well enough; but as they did not foreſee, ſo they did not very cautiouſly guard againſt future Miſtakes. The Effects of it have been carry'd to that height, that it has been thought to ſave *ex opere operato*. And the Neceſſity was very early improv'd ſo far as to be accounted abſolute and indiſpenſible: for ſeveral of the firſt Fathers do pretty plainly ſhow us, they thought that ſuch as died without Baptiſm cou'd not be ſav'd, or at leaſt that their Salvation was very doubtful. This indeed was at firſt meant only of ſuch as had heard the Word preach'd, as I have prov'd to you before; but afterwards came to be equally apply'd to all Adult Per-

Persons: and then, when from its being useful in order to Salvation, they had brought it to be so indispensably Necessary, especially to some, this prepar'd 'em to mistake our LORD's Words, *John* iii. 5. which they began to think expresly asserted, it was impossible for any of *Adam*'s Race to be sav'd without Baptism: and upon this Supposition no wonder if they were soon prevail'd on, by their natural Tenderness and Affection, to secure the Salvation of their belov'd Infants, which lie too near a Parent's Heart to be neglected in so weighty a Point as that of their eternal Felicity. And cou'd it be made appear that this is the true Sense of our SAVIOUR's Words, we shou'd soon be brought to believe He intended Infants shou'd be baptiz'd. 'Tis not only probable that Infant-Baptism came in this way; but that this really was the Case, must be plain enough to those who are acquainted with the Writings of the Fathers. What I have said in several former Letters, proves it in some measure; and if I had thought it needful, I wou'd have taken some Pains to have done it professedly, and more at large. But particularly, nothing can be plainer than that the misunderstanding the Sense of *John* iii. 5. gave rise to the Error; for the Fathers who speak of it, always deduce it from those Words, and upon every Pinch recur to them as their main Retreat: and Mr. *Wall* confesses that they as well as himself look'd upon this Place as the chief ground of Infant-Baptism; and therefore it is pretty certain they had no better Foundation for their Practice, which most now see to be very sandy, and nothing but a Mistake. So that this is not so hard as some fancy to be reconcil'd to the Honesty and Integrity of those pious Men, who were

doubtleſs liable to Miſtakes as well as we. For thus in a Caſe moſt exactly parallel, the ſame Perſons who introduc'd the baptizing of Infants, were equally for admitting 'em immediately after that to the other Sacrament likewiſe, and that upon juſt ſuch another Miſtake of our SAVIOUR's Words too: for as they infer'd the Neceſſity of Baptiſm from *John* iii. 5. ſo they did alſo that of the Euchariſt from *John* vi. 53. Thus St. *Auſtin*, from theſe very Texts, at the ſame time * argues for baptizing and communicating Infants. And this Cuſtom of communicating Infants accompany'd the baptizing 'em, even from the firſt riſe of Pædobaptiſm, for ſeveral hundred Years together, as in the *Greek* Church it does to this day. All which is ſo true and manifeſt, as to be pretty generally acknowledg'd. † Dr. *Taylor* ſomewhat largely proves it, and frequently ſays the one is altogether as well grounded as the other; and indeed earneſtly pleads for the Continuance of both. But ſeeing the Church has thought fit to diſuſe one, no Man can ſhew a Reaſon why the other mayn't as well be laid aſide, ſince it is not built on a better Foundation.

Now, Sir, I think to lay down my Pen: for I hope I have ſufficiently prov'd to you, that we have abundant Reaſon to perſiſt in our Opinion; and that Mr. *Wall* has not ſo effectually done our Buſineſs, as you at firſt believ'd. I recommend what I have ſaid to your ſerious Peruſal: and give me leave to put you in mind, that it is very dangerous to make too free with our SAVIOUR's poſi-

* De Peccator. Merit. & Remiſſion. lib. 1. cap. 20.
† *Worthy Communicant*, cap. 2. Sect. 2.

tive

tive Institutions, for which you must expect to account in the last Day. Let it therefore be your diligent Care to judg impartially, having no other Aim but to glorify GOD, and obey His Truth: to whom I commit you.

I am, *&c.*

FINIS.

A TABLE of the Texts of Scripture explain'd or cited in the foregoing LETTERS.

Geneſis.

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
i.	2.	377
ii.	24.	155
xi.	1.	347
—	9.	155
xxxv.	2.	366

Exodus.

xii.	22.	137
xiv.	21.	377
xv.	4.	142
xvii.	8, *&c.*	373
xix.	10.	365, 390
—	15.	366
xxix.	4.	156, 377
—	36.	518
xxx.	18.	377
—	21.	155

Leviticus.

iv.	6.	137, 141
—	17.	137
vi.	27.	517
ix.	9.	137
xi.	31.	148
—	32.	137, 148, 150, 151, 162, 174
—	33.	148
xiv.	6.	137
—	8.	369

Leviticus.

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
xiv.	16.	137, 139
—	23.	150
—	51.	137, 139
xv.	—	150
—	5.	369
—	13.	*ibid.*
—	16.	147
xx.	7.	368, 514
xxi.	23.	368
xxii.	6.	150, 151, 164

Numbers.

vi.	9.	149
viii.	7.	150
xix.	7, 8.	147
—	9.	146, 147, 150
—	13.	202
—	18.	137, 146, 148, 151
—	19.	149
—	21.	147
xxxi.	19, 24.	367
—	21, *&c.*	149
—	23.	151, 518

Deuteronomy.

xvii.	11.	345
xxxiii.	24.	137

Joshua.

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
iii.	5.	367
—	15.	137
v.	2, &c.	446

Judges.

vi.	38.	143

Ruth.

ii.	14.	137

1 *Samuel.*

xii.	2.	463
xiv.	27.	137
xvii.	49.	144
xxi.	4.	366

2 *Kings.*

iii.	11.	153, 156
v.	—	147
—	14.	137, 147
viii.	15.	137

2 *Chronicles.*

iv.	6.	156

Nehemiah.

xiii.	23.	517

Esther.

iii.	11.	347

Job.

ix.	31.	137
xxxi.	18.	463

Psalms.

xxxii.	6.	155
lxviii.	23.	137
lxxi.	5.	463
—	17.	*ibid.*

Psalms.

xciv.	12.	311
cxxxiii.	3.	143

Proverbs.

xxviii.	21.	155

Canticles.

vii.	2.	203

Isaiah.

i.	16, 17	445
xxi.	4.	140

Jeremiah.

iv.	4.	447
x.	2.	311
xi.	19.	348

Ezekiel.

xvi.	6.	329
—	9.	*ibid.*
xxii.	26.	514

Daniel.

iv.	23.	142
—	25.	*ibid.*
—	33.	141, 142
v.	21.	*ibid.*

Judith.

xii.	7.	137

Eccluſ.

xxxi.	26.	145
xxxiv.	26.	146

2 *Maccab.*

i.	19.	145
—	21.	*ibid.*

A Table of Texts of Scripture.

Matthew.

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
iii.	5, 6.	257, 331, 383
——	7.	352
——	8.	385
iv.	15.	358
v.	8.	410
——	12.	8
vi.	9.	514
xi.	1.	312
xii.	—	196
——	2.	119
——	34.	352
xiii.	52.	285
xv.	6.	228
——	14.	352
xix.	5.	155
——	14.	430, 536
xx.	1.	462
——	22.	177
xxi.	31.	352
xxiii.	—	*ibid.*
——	17.	518
——	19.	*ibid.*
——	23.	171
xxv.	40.	87
xxvi.	23.	172, 181
xxvii.	57.	275
xxviii.	19.	221, 226, 247, 272, 305, 306, 307, 314, 321, 461, 531
——	20.	313

Mark.

i.	4.	487
——	5.	187
——	8.	194

Mark.

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
ii.	4.	101
vii.	3.	157
——	4.	159—162
——	5.	152
——	8.	228, 352
viii.	26.	413
x.	14.	421
——	17.	332
——	20.	463
——	37.	184
——	38.	*ibid.*
xi.	25.	413
xiv.	20.	181
——	70.	358
xvi.	15.	306, 307, 321
——	16.	419

Luke.

iii.	7.	194
——	12.	*ibid.*
——	16.	184
v.	4, 5.	101
xi.	38.	152, 160, 161
xiii.	6, &c.	425
xiv.	26.	361
xvi.	24.	180
xxiv.	14.	469
——	21.	*ibid.*
——	47.	292, 321

John.

i.	13.	422
iii.	3.	410
——	5.	17, 226, 317, 403, &c. 483, 535, 545, 546

John.

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
iii.	6.	422, 484
—	7.	485
—	12.	*ibid.*
—	18.	420
—	23.	134, 187
iv.	1.	292, 459
—	2.	459
vi.	45.	277
—	53.	17, 418
viii.	31.	411
ix.	27.	299
xiii.	5.	156
—	26.	181
—	35.	11
xv.	22.	415
xx.	23.	228

Acts.

i.	5.	184
ii.	38.	460
vii.	51.	352
viii.	37.	320
—	38.	134, 188
ix.	25.	101
x.	42.	292, 321
xiii.	24.	487
xiv.	21.	320
xv.	10.	295
xvii.	30.	509
xviii.	23.	299
xix.	4.	385, 487
xxiv.	14.	7
xxv.	19.	356

Romans.

ii.	1.	32
—	12.	415
—	28.	357

Romans.

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
ii.	29.	417, 450
iii.	19.	415
iv.	15.	*ibid.*
v.	9.	441
—	10.	*ibid.*
—	11.	*ibid.*
—	14.	*ibid.* 442
vi.	3, 4.	134, 189, 194 204, 272
viii.	*init.*	422
x.	14.	416
xii.	2.	482
xiv.	15.	76
xvi.	17.	59

1 *Corinth.*

iv.	1.	6
—	15.	491
vii.	14.	204, 513, 540
viii.	9.	76
—	12, 13.	*ibid.*
x.	2.	184
xi.	18.	58
—	28.	409, 412
—	34.	412
xv.	2, 3.	312

2 *Corinth.*

vi.	14, 15.	3
—	17.	59

Galat.

i.	8.	312
—	9.	228, 312
iii.	27.	272
—	29.	357
iv.	19.	491
v.	1.	5

Galat.

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
v.	6.	418
vi.	15.	418,450,486

Epheſ.

iv.	5.	15, 84
—	22.	450

Coloſſ.

ii.	11.	448,449,537
—	12.	135,189,194, 448, 537
iii.	9,10.	450,482

1 *Timoth.*

ii.	4.	509
iii.	2.	30
vi.	9.	126, 184
—	16.	410

2 *Timoth.*

iii.	15.	461

Titus.

iii.	5.	482, 486

Hebrews.

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
ix.	10.	168, 328
—	19.	139
—	26.	51
x.	10.	*ibid.*
—	12.	*ibid.*
—	14.	*ibid.*
—	18.	*ibid.*
xi.	6.	509
xii.	14.	*ibid.*

1 *Peter.*

iii.	21.	416,422,512

1 *John.*

iii.	9.	422
iv.	8.	22

Revelat.

xix.	13.	182

A CATALOGUE of the Authors, cited and made uſe of in the foregoing LETTERS.

A.

Æliani Variæ Hiſtoriæ. Lugdun. Batavorum, 1701.
Arati Phœnomen. Baſiliæ, 1570.
Ariſtophanis Comœdiæ. Lugdun. 1624.
Ariſtotelis Opera. Aureliæ Allobrog. 1605.
Arriani Commentar. de Epictet. Londini 1670.
Athenæi Deipnoſophiſt.
Auguſtini Opera. Colon. Agripp. 1616.

B.

S. Barnabæ Epiſtola Catholica inter Patres Apoſtolic. per Clericum. Antwerp. 1700.
Baronii Annales Eccleſiaſtici.
Barthii Notæ ad Rutilii Itinerarium.
Baſilii Opera. Pariſ. 1618.
Rab. Benjaminis Itinerarium.
Beverigii Codex Canon. ad Calcem Patr. Apoſtolic. per Cleric. Antwerp. 1700.
——— *Annotationes in Canones, ibid.*
Alberti Bobovii Turcarum Liturgia. Oxon. 1690.
Lucæ Brugenſis Notæ ad Varias Lectiones Græc. N. T. in Bibl. Polyglott. Lond. 1657.
——— *In quatuor Evangelia. Antwerp.* 1606.
Martin. Buceri Enarrationes in quatuor Evangelia. Argentorat. 1530.
Busbii Gram. Græc. Lond. 1689.
Buxtorfii Lexicon Talmudicum. Baſil. 1639.
——— *De Abbreviaturis, &c. Franequer.* 1696.
——— *Synagoga Judaica.*

Cal-

C.

Callimachi Hymn. Ultrajecti, 1697.
Cameronis Annotationes in N. T. inter Criticos Sacros. Francofurti, 1696.
Cappelli Annotationes, inter Criticos Sacros. Francofurti.
Caſauboni Annotationes, inter Criticos Sacros.
——— *Exercitationes in Baronium.*
Caſſiodor. Inſtitut. Divin. Lect.
Caſtelli Lexicon Heptaglott. Lond. 1669.
Chryſoſtomi Opera.
Ciceronis Opera. Lond. 1681.
Lord *Clarendon*'s Hiſtory of the Rebellion, *Fol.*
Clementis Alexandrini Opera. Lutetiæ, 1629.
Clementis Homiliæ inter Patres Apoſtol. Antwerp. 1700.
Clementis Roman. Epiſtola ad Corinth. inter Patres Apoſtol. Antwerp. 1700.
Clerici Ars Critica, Tom. 3. *Amſtel.* 1700.
——— *Parrhaſiana, Amſterd.* 1701.
——— *Verſio Gallica N.T. cum notis. Amſterd.* 1703.
——— *Bibliotheque Choiſie, Tom.* 13. *Amſterd.* 1707.
Conſtantini Lexicon.
Conſtitutiones Apoſtolicæ inter Patres Apoſtolic. Antwerp. 1700.
Cotelerii Notæ in Recognitiones, ibid.
Cypriani Opera Amſtelodam. 1700.
Cyrilli Hieroſolymitani Opera.

D.

Daillé de Uſu Patrum.
Danetii Dictionarium Antiq. Rom. Græc. Pariſ. 1698.
Diogenis Laertii Vitæ.
Dionyſii Halicarnaſſæi Opera. Oxon. 1704.
——— ——— *Vita Homeri inter Opuſcula Mythologica per Gale. Amſterd.* 1688.
Dionyſii Epiſcop. Alexandrin. Epiſtola ad Dionyſ. Presbyter. apud Euſeb.
Dodwell's Epiſtolary Diſcourſe.
——— *Diſſertationes Cyprianicæ ad Calcem Operum Cyprian. edit Amſtel.* 1700.

A Table of Authors.

Dodwell's Two Letters of Advice. *Lond.* 1691.
——— *Diſſertationes in Irenæum. Oxon.* 1689.
——— *De Jure Laic. Sacerdot.*
Dorrington on Infant-Baptiſm. *Lond.* 1701.
Druſii Annotationes in Nov. Teſt. inter Criticos. Francofurt. 1696.

E.

Edwards's Exercitations. *Lond.* 1702.
R. Eliezaris Pirke. Venetiis, 1544.
Epiphanii Opera.
Epiſcopii Opera. Lond. 1678.
Eraſmi Annotationes N. T. inter Criticos Sacros. Francofurt. 1696.
Euripidis Tragœdiæ per Barneſium.
——— *Scholiaſta.*
Euſebii Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. Lutet. Pariſ. 1544.
——— *Vita Conſtantini, ibid.*
R. Ezechiæ Chaskuni. Venetiis, 1524.

F.

Featly's Dipper Dip'd, *Lond.* 1651.
Feuardentii Notæ in Irænæum. Oxon. 1702.

G.

R. D. Ganz Tzemach David. Pragæ, 1592.
Gloſſarium Latino Græcum ad Calcem Irenæi. Ox. 1702.
Grabe in Irenæum. Oxon. 1702.
Gregorii Nazianzen. Opera.
Gregorii Thaumaturgi Opera. Pariſ. 1622.
Grotii Annotationes inter Criticos Sacros. Francof. 1696.

H.

Hammond's Annotations, *Lond.* 1659.
——— Six Queries, *Lond.* 1653.
——— *Diſſertationes de Epiſcop. Jure. Lond.* 1651.
Harpocration.
Hegeſippus apud Euſeb. Pariſ. 1544.
Heraclidis Pontici Allegoriæ Homeri, inter Opuſc. Mythologic. per Gale. Amſterd. 1688.
Hermæ Paſtor inter Patres Apoſtolic. per Cleric. Antwerp. 1700.

Hero-

A Table of Authors.

Herodoti Hiſtoria per Stephan. 1570.
Heſychius.
Hide Annotationes in Bobovii Turcar. Lit. Ox. 1690.
Hieronymi Opera. Colon. Agripp. 1616.
——— *Verſio Chronici Euſeb. Amſtel.* 1658.
——— *De Locis Hebraicis.*
Hill de Presbyteratu. Lond. 1691.
Homerus cum Euſtathii Parecbolis. Romæ.
——— *Cum Dydimi Interpret. Baſil.* 1535.
——— *Batrachomyomachia. Baſil.* 1582.
Horatii Poemata, Lond. 1690.
Huetii Origeniana edit. cum Origenis Commentar. Græc. Lat. Colon. 1685.

I.

Ignatii Epiſtolæ inter Patres Apoſtolic. per Cleric. Antwerp. 1700.
Joſephi Opera, Genevæ, 1635.
Irenæi Opera, Oxon. 1702.
R. Iſaac Chiſſuk Emunah. Altdorf. Noric. 1681.
Jurieu Lettres Paſtorales.
Juſtini Martyris Opera, Pariſ. 1636.
Juvenalis Satyræ, Lond. 1669.

L

Lactantii Opera. Lugdun. Bat. 1660.
Leti Ceremoniale, Amſterd. 1685.
Lightfoot's Works, *Lond.* 1684.
Limborchi Theologia Chriſtiana, Amſterd. 1700.
Lipſius in Tacitum.
Lock of Humane Underſtanding, *Lond.* 1700.
Lockmanni Fabulæ, Leid. 1615.
Luciani Opera, Amſtel. 1687.
Ludolfi Lexicon Ethiopic. Lond. 1661.
Lycophronis Alexandra Oxon. 1697.
Lyſis Epiſtol. inter Opuſc. Mythologic. per Gale. Amſterd. 1688.

M.

Maimonidis Porta Moſis, Oxon. 1655.
Marcus Antoninus, Lond. 1697.
M. S. Nov. Teſt. Roberti Stephani.

M. S.

A Table of Authors.

M. S. N. T. Bezæ Cantabrigiæ.
—— *Alexandrin.*
Midraſch Chumaſch. Venetiis.
Milton's Paradiſe Loſt, *Lond.* 1675.
Moſchi Idyll. inter Poetas Minores, Lond. 1677.
Munſteri Annotat. in Bibl. inter Criticos. Francofurti, 1696.

N.

C. Nepotis Vitæ Imperatorum, &c. Lugdun. 1684.
Nicholſon's Letter to Sir *William Dugdale*, in *Camden's Britannia, Lond.* 1695.
Biſhop *Nicholſon* on the Catechiſm.
Nizzachon Vetus, Altdorf. Noricor. 1681.

O.

Ovidii Opera, Amſtel. 1664.
Origenis Commentar. Græc. Lat. Colon. 1685.
—— *Contra Celſum, Cantabrig.* 1677.
—— *Opera Latin. Baſil.* 1571.
—— *Philocalia ad Calcem Lib. contra Celſum. Cantab.* 1677.

P.

Pearſonii Notæ in Cyprianum, Amſterd. 1700.
Perizonii Not. in Sanctii Minerv. Franequer. 1702.
Petavii Dogmata Theolog. Antwerp 1700.
—— *Animadverſiones in Epiphan.*
—— *Notæ in Themiſtium, Pariſ.* 1618.
Phavorinus.
Pindari Olympia, &c. Oxon. 1697.
—— *Scholiaſta.*
Du Pin's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, *Vol.* 1. *Lond.* 1692.
—— —— —— *Vol.* 3. *Lond.* 1698.
Platonis Opera, Francofurti, 1602.
Plutarchi Opera apud Stephan. 1572.
Pocockii Notæ Miſcellan. Oxon. 1655.
Pollucis Onomaſticon.
Polycratis Epiſtola ad Victor, apud Euſeb.
Le Prieur Annotationes in Tertullian, Pariſ. 1675.

R.

A Table of Authors.

R.

Recognitiones inter Patres Apoſtol. Antwerp. 1700.
Relandus de Religione Mohamed. Ultraject. 1705.
Rigaltii Notæ in Tertullian. Pariſ. 1675.
——— *Notæ in Cyprian. Amſtel.* 1700.
Ruſhworth's Collections.

S.

R. Salomonis Jarchi Comment. in Bibl. edit. per Buxtorf. in Bibl. Heb. & Chald. Baſil. 1618.
Sanctii Minerva, Franequer, 1702.
Biſhop of *Sarum*'s Expoſition of the 39 Articles, *Lond.* 1700.
Scaligerana, Colon. 1695.
R. Schem Tof Mizbeach Hazzahab. Baſil. 1602.
Senecæ Opera, Amſterd. 1634.
Socratis Scholaſtici Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Pariſ. 1544.
Sophoclis Tragœdiæ.
Stennett's Anſwer to *Ruſſen, Lond.* 1704.
Stephani Theſaurus Ling. Græc. 1572.
Strabonis Geographia, Amſtel. 1707.
Suetonii Vitæ Cæſarum, Amſtel. 1630.
Suidas.

T.

Taciti Hiſtoriarum Libb.
Talmud Babylonicum. Venetiis, 1520.
Targum Jonathan. in Bibl. Polyglott. Lond. 1657.
——— *Jeruſalem, ibid.*
——— *Onkelos, ibid.*
Tarini Notæ in Origenis Philocal. ad Calcem Libb. contra Celſum. Cantabrig. 1677.
Taylor's Worthy Communicant.
Terentii Comœdiæ, Lond. 1700.
Tertulliani Opera, Pariſ. 1675.
Themiſtii Orationes, Pariſ. 1618.
Theocriti Idyll. inter Poet. Minor. Cantabrig. 1677.
Theodoreti Hiſt. Eccleſ. edit. cum Euſeb. Pariſ. 1544.
Theophylacti Opera.
Theophili Antiocheni ad Autolyc. Libb. ad calcem Juſtini Martyris, Pariſ. 1636.

A Table of Authors.

Thucydides, Oxon. 1696.
Toldoth Jeschu, Altdorf. Noric. 1681.
Turrettini Institutiones Theolog. Lugduni 1696.

U.

Valesii Notæ in Eusebii Hist. Eccles.
Vatabli Annotationes inter Criticos. Francofurti, 1696.
Versio Syriaca N. T. in Bibl. Polyglott. Lond. 1657.
——— *Arabica, ibid.*
——— *Ethiopica, ibid.*
——— *Persica, ibid.*
——— LXX *Viralis, Lond.* 1653.
——— *Hebraica, Paris.* 1584.
——— ——— *per Hutterum.*
Ariæ Montani in Polyglott.
Vulgata, ibid.
Sixti V.
Bezæ.
Erasmi.
Castalionis, Amsterd. 1683.
Italica.
Diodati.
Hispanica.
Gallica Genevæ.
——— *Lugduni.*
Belgica.
Danica.
Saxonica.
Græca Vulgaris.
Virgilii Opera, Lond. 1688.
——— By *Dryden,* 1709.
Vorstii Observationes in Tzemach David. Ludg. Bat. 1644.
Vossii Etymologicon. Amstel. 1695.

W.

Wemmeri Lexicon Ethiopicum.
Whitby's Annotations, *Lond.* 1706.

MVSEVM BRITANNICVM

